

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARM LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

QUALCOMM INC., QUALCOMM  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and NUVIA, INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 22-1146-MN

**EXHIBIT B TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL AND REDACT**

Dated: January 3, 2025

OF COUNSEL:

Daralyn J. Durie  
Joyce Liou  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 268-7000  
[ddurie@mofo.com](mailto:ddurie@mofo.com)  
[jliou@mofo.com](mailto:jliou@mofo.com)

Erik J. Olson  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 813-5600  
[ejolson@mofo.com](mailto:ejolson@mofo.com)

Kyle W.K. Mooney  
Kyle D. Friedland  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 468-8000  
[kmooney@mofo.com](mailto:kmooney@mofo.com)  
[kfriedland@mofo.com](mailto:kfriedland@mofo.com)

Scott F. Llewellyn  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
4200 Republic Plaza  
370 Seventeenth Street  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 592-1500  
[sllewellyn@mofo.com](mailto:sllewellyn@mofo.com)

Nicholas Rylan Fung  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
707 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(213) 892-5200  
[nfung@mofo.com](mailto:nfung@mofo.com)

Daniel Muino  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2100 L Street, NW Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
(202) 887-1500  
[dmuino@mofo.com](mailto:dmuino@mofo.com)

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT &  
TAYLOR, LLP

Anne Shea Gaza (No. 4093)  
Robert M. Vrana (No. 5666)  
Samantha G. Wilson (No. 5816)  
Rodney Square  
1000 North King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 571-6600  
[agaza@ycst.com](mailto:agaza@ycst.com)  
[rvrana@ycst.com](mailto:rvrana@ycst.com)  
[swilson@ycst.com](mailto:swilson@ycst.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Arm Ltd.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on January 3, 2025, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the counsel listed below in the manner indicated:

**BY EMAIL**

Jack B. Blumenfeld  
Jennifer Ying  
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT  
& TUNNELL LLP  
1201 North Market Street  
P.O. Box 1347  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
[jblumenfeld@morrisonichols.com](mailto:jblumenfeld@morrisonichols.com)  
[jying@morrisonichols.com](mailto:jying@morrisonichols.com)

Isaac B. Zaur  
Nora Niedzielski-Eichner  
CLARICK GUERON REISBAUM LLP  
220 Fifth Avenue, 14th Floor  
New York, NY 10001  
[izaaur@cgr-law.com](mailto:izaaur@cgr-law.com)  
[nniedzie@cgr-law.com](mailto:nniedzie@cgr-law.com)

Catherine Nyarady  
Anna R. Gressel  
Jacob A. Braly  
Alexander M. Butwin  
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,  
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
[cnyarady@paulweiss.com](mailto:cnyarady@paulweiss.com)  
[agressel@paulweiss.com](mailto:agressel@paulweiss.com)  
[jbraly@paulweiss.com](mailto:jbraly@paulweiss.com)  
[abutwin@paulweiss.com](mailto:abutwin@paulweiss.com)

Karen L. Dunn  
William A. Isaacson  
Melissa F. Zappala  
Erin J. Morgan  
Anna P. Lipin  
William T. Marks  
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,  
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP  
2001 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
[kdunn@paulweiss.com](mailto:kdunn@paulweiss.com)  
[wisaacson@paulweiss.com](mailto:wisaacson@paulweiss.com)  
[mzappala@paulweiss.com](mailto:mzappala@paulweiss.com)  
[ejmorgan@paulweiss.com](mailto:ejmorgan@paulweiss.com)  
[alipin@paulweiss.com](mailto:alipin@paulweiss.com)  
[wmarks@paulweiss.com](mailto:wmarks@paulweiss.com)

Andrea L. D'Ambra  
Susana Medeiros  
Kira Latham  
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP  
1301 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
[andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com)  
[susana.medeiros@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:susana.medeiros@nortonrosefulbright.com)  
[kira.latham@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:kira.latham@nortonrosefulbright.com)

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT &  
TAYLOR, LLP

*/s/ Robert M. Vrana*

---

Anne Shea Gaza (No. 4093)  
Robert M. Vrana (No. 5666)  
Samantha G. Wilson (No. 5816)  
Rodney Square  
1000 North King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 571-6600  
agaza@ycst.com  
rvrana@ycst.com  
swilson@ycst.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Arm Ltd.*

## **Exhibit B**

## 13:41:50 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

3  
4  
5 ARM LTD., )  
6 a U.K. corporation, )  
7 Plaintiff, ) ) C.A. No. 22-1146 (MN)  
8 v. )  
9 )  
10 QUALCOMM, INC., )  
11 a Delaware corporation, )  
12 et al., )  
13 Defendants. )  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Wednesday, November 20, 2024  
2:00 p.m.  
Pretrial Conference

844 King Street  
Wilmington, Delaware

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE MARYELLEN NOREIKA  
United States District Court Judge

APPEARANCES:

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR  
BY: ANNE SHEA GAZA, ESQ.  
BY: ROBERT M. VRANA, ESQ.  
BY: DANIEL MACKRIDES, ESQ.

-and-

## 1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd) :

2  
3 MORRISON FOERSTER, LLP  
4 BY: DARALYN DURIE, ESQ.  
5 BY: ERIK OLSON, ESQ.  
6 BY: DANIEL MUINO, ESQ.  
7 BY: SHAELYN DAWSON, ESQ.  
8 BY: NICHOLAS FUNG, ESQ.  
9 BY: HENRY HUTTINGER, ESQ.  
10 BY: LAURA GILBERT REMUS, ESQ.

7 Counsel for the Plaintiff  
8  
9

10 MORRIS NICHOLS ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP  
11 BY: JACK BLUMENFELD, ESQ.  
12 BY: JENNIFER YING, ESQ.

13 -and-

14 PAUL WEISS  
15 BY: KAREN L. DUNN, ESQ.  
16 BY: CATHERINE NYARDY, ESQ.  
17 BY: JACOB BRALY, ESQ.  
18 BY: RUBY GARRETT, ESQ.  
19 BY: ERIN MORGAN, ESQ.  
20 BY: ANNA LIPIN, ESQ.  
21 BY: FLINT PATTERSON, ESQ.

18 Counsel for the Defendants  
19  
20  
21

22 -----  
23  
24  
25

14:00:58 23

14:00:58 24 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. The United States  
14:00:58 25 District Court for the District of Delaware is now in

14:04:02 1 session. The Honorable Maryellen Noreika presiding.

14:04:02 2 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon,

14:04:04 3 everyone. Please be seated.

14:04:06 4 All right. Ms. Gaza.

14:04:09 5 MS. GAZA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Anne

14:04:11 6 Gaza from Young, Conaway on behalf of plaintiff, ARM. I'm

14:04:15 7 joined today by Daralyn Durie, Erik Olson, Shaelyn Dawson,

14:04:22 8 Nicholas Fung, Daniel Muino, Henry Huttinger, Laura Gilbert

14:04:28 9 Remus all from Morrison Foerster as well as my colleagues,

14:04:32 10 Rehoboth Vrana and Daniel Mackrides.

14:04:35 11 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon everyone.

14:04:37 12 MR. BLUMENFELD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

14:04:38 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

14:04:39 14 MR. BLUMENFELD: Jack Blumenfeld from Morris

14:04:44 15 Nichols for Qualcomm and NuVia. With me at counsel table

14:04:47 16 are Karen Dunn, Catherine Nyrady and Jacob Braly from Paul

14:04:53 17 Weiss. Behind them, Jennifer Ying from Morris Nichols, Erin

14:04:57 18 Morgan from Paul Weiss, and behind them, Flint Patterson,

14:05:02 19 Ruby Garrett and, Chris Longman from Qualcomm.

14:05:06 20 THE COURT: All right. Welcome to all of you

14:05:08 21 and good afternoon.

14:05:09 22 Okay. All right. Let me just get my document

14:05:19 23 ready here.

14:05:26 24 So I appreciate the letter that we received last

14:05:31 25 night from the defendants on simplifying the case. I think

14:05:39 1 it's dropping the counterclaims. How are we going to  
14:05:43 2 resolve those?

14:05:46 3 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, they're out of the case,  
14:05:51 4 so we are dropping them as claims.

14:05:54 5 THE COURT: So I always run into this problem  
14:05:56 6 and then I get like after the case are they dismissed, are  
14:06:00 7 they dismissed with prejudice, did you fail to put in  
14:06:03 8 evidence on them, so I'm granting judgment, what are we  
14:06:07 9 doing with them? You can't just say we're dropping them.  
14:06:10 10 They're in the case. How do I get them out of it?

14:06:13 11 MS. DUNN: We can file a voluntary withdraw of  
14:06:16 12 the claims if that is what Your Honor would like.

14:06:22 13 THE COURT: I want to know what you guys have  
14:06:24 14 agreed to do. So have you talked with the other side?

14:06:28 15 MS. DUNN: We talked to the other side and  
14:06:30 16 agreed that we would drop the claims so they're aware. I  
14:06:33 17 don't think we've talked mechanically how we would do that.  
14:06:36 18 We're happy to do that and make a submission to the Court.

14:06:39 19 THE COURT: That would be very helpful.

14:06:40 20 MS. DUNN: Okay.

14:06:41 21 THE COURT: And I don't mean to suggest that I  
14:06:43 22 don't appreciate that you're dropping them, it's just that I  
14:06:47 23 have gotten myself into trouble before when I don't figure  
14:06:50 24 out what that means.

14:06:51 25 MS. DUNN: Understood, Your Honor. Plaintiff's

14:06:53 1 dropped their trademark claims last time on the record.

14:06:56 2 THE COURT: We should probably do something  
14:06:58 3 similar, so maybe you all can figure out how that works. It  
14:07:01 4 was just I should have thought of it before when they did  
14:07:05 5 the trademark claims and I just didn't, but this morning for  
14:07:08 6 some reason reading that letter I had a vision of the  
14:07:11 7 posttrial briefing.

14:07:12 8 MS. DUNN: Understood.

14:07:13 9 THE COURT: And having to deal with it.

14:07:14 10 MS. DUNN: We'll work it out. Thank you, Your  
14:07:17 11 Honor.

14:07:17 12 THE COURT: Thank you. Okay.

14:07:20 13 The Daubert motions, I have a draft order and  
14:07:32 14 for whatever motions are remaining, other than the ones  
14:07:38 15 defendants brought about Mr. Schoettelkotte, I am going to  
14:07:42 16 deny them. And I'll get you that opinion shortly.

14:07:49 17 I'm confused with respect to Mr. Schoettelkotte,  
14:07:53 18 and I read his deposition, and I don't even know how the  
14:07:58 19 person who took that deposition had the patience to deal  
14:08:01 20 with it, because I was trying to understand what he was  
14:08:05 21 testifying on and I don't -- I don't understand it. I mean,  
14:08:10 22 he's an accountant, so I would certainly understand if he  
14:08:13 23 was going to testify about damages. I don't think he should  
14:08:16 24 be testifying to the jury that there are no money damages  
14:08:20 25 because that's an issue for me. So then it seemed like he's

14:08:26 1 left to say, hey, there is reputational damages or there is  
14:08:31 2 potential damages for future contract, but for that, I'm not  
14:08:38 3 sure why he is an expert to do that and he seems like he's  
14:08:42 4 just relying on fact people, factual testimony from people  
14:08:45 5 who could testify and the jury could decide. So I just  
14:08:50 6 don't understand what he's adding as an expert that's in his  
14:08:58 7 expertise.

14:08:59 8 MR. OLSON: So let me start with the opportunity  
14:09:02 9 potentially as we did last time for simplification. We have  
14:09:07 10 told -- there was a discussion on this yesterday. We don't  
14:09:09 11 intend to call Mr. Schoettelkotte before the jury for any  
14:09:12 12 purpose and they don't intend to call -- therefore don't  
14:09:16 13 intend to call Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy had been on two  
14:09:19 14 issues, one, their counterclaims, they've now dropped those,  
14:09:23 15 and then he was responsive to Mr. Schoettelkotte.  
14:09:27 16 Mr. Schoettelkotte's testimony if at all will be relevant to  
14:09:31 17 specific performance and you can decide what weight to give  
14:09:35 18 it in that context.

14:09:37 19 THE COURT: Okay. So how about this. I am  
14:09:40 20 going to deny that motion as moot given that you're not  
14:09:46 21 going to call him before the jury. To the extent that you  
14:09:49 22 do wind up calling him in front of me, you guys can re-raise  
14:09:55 23 any concerns that you have and I'll deal with them. Okay?

14:09:58 24 MR. OLSON: Understood, Your Honor.

14:09:59 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for that.

14:10:00 1                   Okay. Are there any other issues, and I know  
14:10:04 2 you guys offered to tell us in advance what you had come to  
14:10:08 3 an agreement on and I thought it was just as easy at this  
14:10:11 4 point for you to tell me here. So I understand that  
14:10:15 5 Mr. Schoettelkotte and Mr. Kennedy will not be testifying in  
14:10:18 6 front of the jury. Anything else that you all worked out?

14:10:25 7                   MS. YING: Your Honor, Jennifer Ying from Morris  
14:10:27 8 Nichols on behalf of the defendants. There are two  
14:10:29 9 paragraphs in the PTO cover that we have resolved, and then  
14:10:33 10 there are two MILs that the parties have reached agreement  
14:10:37 11 on that we'll put on the record. With regards to the PTO  
14:10:40 12 cover, paragraph 49, the parties have agreed to adopt  
14:10:45 13 defendants' proposal on demonstratives that need to be  
14:10:48 14 disclosed. For paragraph 72 in the PTO cover, the parties  
14:10:55 15 have also agreed to adopt defendants' proposal regarding  
14:10:59 16 disclosing transition statements in connection with  
14:11:02 17 deposition testimony.

14:11:05 18                   THE COURT: Okay.

14:11:06 19                   MS. YING: I will turn the floor over to  
14:11:08 20 Mr. Olson with regards to plaintiff, ARM MIL number 1 that  
14:11:12 21 we've reached an agreement on and then I will put on the  
14:11:15 22 record our agreement for defendants' MIL number 3 that we've  
14:11:19 23 also reached agreement on.

14:11:20 24                   THE COURT: Okay. Give me one second. Remove  
14:11:26 25 those other paragraphs. Okay. Which motion in limine is

14:11:30 1 this?

14:11:31 2 MR. OLSON: This is motion in limine number 1  
14:11:33 3 having to do with evidence and argument regarding specific  
14:11:36 4 performance, Your Honor. What the parties have agreed is  
14:11:40 5 that -- I want to get the defendant -- they use -- I'm  
14:11:48 6 reading from an e-mail. The defendants agree not to make  
14:11:52 7 arguments or present evidence regarding ARM's requested  
14:11:55 8 remedies, specific performance, or the scope, nature or  
14:11:59 9 impact of that requested remedy. Plaintiffs understand that  
14:12:04 10 defendants want to be able to present evidence regarding  
14:12:07 11 Section 15.1 of the NuVia ALA and correspondence between the  
14:12:13 12 parties and Qualcomm regarding ARM's request that Qualcomm  
14:12:17 13 comply with that provision as well as examine ARM's  
14:12:21 14 witnesses regarding the requests and the parties'  
14:12:23 15 communications. And as a reminder, Section 15.1 includes  
14:12:27 16 the words licensee, NuVia. We will immediately discontinue  
14:12:34 17 any use and distribution of a series things and that  
14:12:38 18 includes licensee shall either destroy or return to ARM a  
14:12:42 19 series of things.

14:12:43 20 Further, defendants in their response and  
14:12:47 21 agreement said that defendants intend to argue at trial that  
14:12:49 22 the remedy provided in 15.1 includes the destruction of  
14:12:54 23 material and that ARM sought destruction. With those  
14:12:58 24 statements, there is an agreement that there will not be,  
14:13:01 25 again, evidence and argument regarding specific performance.

14:13:05 1 THE COURT: All right. And defendants agree?

14:13:10 2 MS. DUNN: We do, Your Honor.

14:13:11 3 THE COURT: Thank you.

14:13:13 4 MS. YING: Your Honor, with respect to

14:13:17 5 defendants' motion in limine number 3, and that's regarding

14:13:19 6 the Apple v. Williams case and the use of documents from

14:13:23 7 that litigation, the parties have agreed that ARM may

14:13:26 8 question Mr. Williams about the substance of those documents

14:13:30 9 subject to the following: ARM will not reference the NuVia

14:13:34 10 or Williams Bates stamps on those documents and will not

14:13:38 11 reference the Apple v. Williams litigation or that these

14:13:43 12 documents came from that litigation. Defendants have

14:13:45 13 represented that the documents were collected prior to the

14:13:50 14 termination of the NuVia ALA and on that basis, ARM will not

14:13:54 15 examine Mr. Williams regarding whether he personally

14:13:57 16 possessed the documents produced in the Apple v. Williams

14:14:01 17 litigation following the termination of the NuVia ALA.

14:14:06 18 ARM will not argue that the possession of these

14:14:09 19 documents post termination of the NuVia ALA constitutes a

14:14:14 20 violation or breach of Section 15.1 of the NuVia ALA. ARM

14:14:19 21 reserves the right to refer to the Bates stamps if

14:14:23 22 Mr. Williams denies that he personally possessed these

14:14:26 23 documents bearing the Williams stamps or that NuVia did not

14:14:30 24 possess the documents bearing the NuVia stamp. And

14:14:33 25 defendants do not waive any argument that the Apple v.

14:14:36 1 William documents constitute ARM confidential information or  
14:14:40 2 are subject to the NuVia ALA termination provision.

14:14:45 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And you all  
14:14:47 4 agree to that, plaintiffs?

14:14:49 5 MS. DURIE: Yes, Your Honor.

14:14:49 6 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for coming to those  
14:14:53 7 agreements.

14:14:53 8 All right. Then we have ARM's motion in limine  
14:14:59 9 number 2 which is excluding evidence that either party  
14:15:03 10 breached the Qualcomm ALA including the October 22nd letter.  
14:15:11 11 And this one -- all right. Let me hear from ARM.

14:15:31 12 MR. OLSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

14:15:39 13 First there is agreement within the papers that  
14:15:45 14 defendants will not refer to the second lawsuit or to the  
14:15:48 15 allegations of breach regarding Section [REDACTED]

14:15:53 16 THE COURT: Or [REDACTED]

14:15:54 17 MR. OLSON: Or [REDACTED] correct. So those issues,  
14:15:59 18 that part of the motion in limine is resolved.

14:16:02 19 It appears that the center of the issue is the  
14:16:08 20 October 22nd letter.

14:16:09 21 THE COURT: Just so I'm clear, it was -- I  
14:16:14 22 didn't understand it to be referring to the lawsuit, I  
14:16:17 23 understood it to be mentioning that there was another  
14:16:20 24 breach. So by you saying you're not going to refer to the  
14:16:24 25 lawsuit, you mean they're not going to assert that there was

14:16:27 1 a breach?

14:16:28 2 MR. OLSON: That they're not going to assert or  
14:16:30 3 make claims, introduce evidence regarding a separate breach  
14:16:34 4 of the ALA. And I understand them to not -- to saying that  
14:16:39 5 they're not going to refer to the lawsuit, I may have that  
14:16:42 6 wrong.

14:16:42 7 THE COURT: I wanted to make sure it was both.

14:16:45 8 MS. DUNN: Yes, Your Honor, it was both, we  
14:16:47 9 don't believe those breaches --

14:16:48 10 THE COURT: You're not going to be talking about  
14:16:50 11 those?

14:16:51 12 MS. DUNN: Yes, we're not going to be talking  
14:16:53 13 about it.

14:16:53 14 THE COURT: All right. Okay. And I think I got  
14:16:56 15 from the papers that you said with respect to that, the only  
14:17:00 16 reason you would do that is if they opened the door to  
14:17:03 17 something, which makes sense.

14:17:04 18 MS. DUNN: Yes, Your Honor.

14:17:05 19 THE COURT: Okay. Then we have the October 22nd  
14:17:07 20 letter which defendants says evidences ARM's scheme to  
14:17:12 21 prevent Qualcomm from commercializing its custom CPU.

14:17:17 22 MR. OLSON: Understood, Your Honor. And we  
14:17:18 23 don't believe that the letter has any probative evidence  
14:17:21 24 towards the question of the license defense which is the  
14:17:25 25 only issue under which it would have a meaning or importance

14:17:29 1 in connection with this trial.

14:17:30 2 And the license defense entirely depends on what  
14:17:35 3 is the nature and scope of the Qualcomm ALA and license. It  
14:17:40 4 does not then depend on what notices of material breach were  
14:17:45 5 given, whether those will result in cure, what discussions  
14:17:48 6 are happening between the parties over cure and what will  
14:17:52 7 happen if it is not cured.

14:17:54 8 Moreover, California law generally says that  
14:18:00 9 the motives for enforcing a contract are not relevant to the  
14:18:06 10 determination of whether or not a breach has occurred within  
14:18:10 11 the nature and scope of the existing contract. You  
14:18:14 12 determine the nature and scope of the contract based on the  
14:18:18 13 language of the agreement and the scope of its license. For  
14:18:22 14 both of these reasons, the evidence is not relevant.

14:18:27 15 And the Century 21 case speaks to that issue.  
14:18:31 16 So also the Century 21 case also cites a Seventh Circuit  
14:18:36 17 opinion called *Tuf Racing Products v. American Suzuki* which  
14:18:42 18 is 223 F.3d 585 from Judge Posner speaking to the same issue  
14:18:48 19 regarding motive for enforcement. Your motive for enforcing  
14:18:53 20 a contract is not evidence of whether or not the contract is  
14:18:57 21 being breached or not being breached in the context.

14:19:00 22 And given these circumstances, we don't believe  
14:19:05 23 that it provides any relevance and it further then creates  
14:19:08 24 undue prejudice under 403 in light of the creating a  
14:19:16 25 question in the jury's mind regarding -- in many ways what

14:19:20 1 goes also to specific performance of what the downstream  
14:19:24 2 effects may be one way or the other.

14:19:26 3 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from  
14:19:28 4 defendants.

14:19:28 5 MR. OLSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

14:19:30 6 MS. NYARADY: Thank you, Your Honor. Catherine  
14:19:34 7 Nyarady for Qualcomm. As Mr. Olson said and is in our  
14:19:38 8 papers, we do have a defense based on -- we have a  
14:19:40 9 counterclaim and a defense based on the Qualcomm ALA covers  
14:19:44 10 our products. And with respect to Qualcomm's alleged breach  
14:19:50 11 under the Qualcomm ALA, ARM itself has put that in the case  
14:19:56 12 starting at the very beginning. When you go to their answer  
14:19:59 13 at DI 21, they say Qualcomm is not only trying to develop an  
14:20:06 14 unlicensed product, but it's also materially breaching its  
14:20:09 15 ALA with ARM. It then goes on multiple more times in  
14:20:14 16 paragraph 250 --

14:20:15 17 THE COURT: Wait, I thought you guys agreed that  
14:20:20 18 nobody was going to talk about breaching the Qualcomm ALA.

14:20:25 19 MS. NYARADY: That's with respect to ARM's  
14:20:27 20 breach of the ALA, that's the subject of the second lawsuit.  
14:20:30 21 I think we're talking here the second piece of this that is  
14:20:33 22 not agreed upon is the Qualcomm breach which is the subject  
14:20:35 23 of that October 22nd letter as well. And I'm just making  
14:20:38 24 the point, Your Honor, that this breach has been in the case  
14:20:42 25 since the very beginning. And it's been in the case as a

14:20:46 1 result of the response that ARM gave to our counterclaim and  
14:20:50 2 to our defense when we said that we're licensed under the  
14:20:53 3 Qualcomm ALA.

14:20:55 4 So as early as November 15, 2022, in DI 21,  
14:21:00 5 there are multiple allegations made by ARM in the pleadings,  
14:21:07 6 at paragraph 250 they say Qualcomm is materially breaching  
14:21:10 7 its own ALA and giving ARM the right to terminate that  
14:21:15 8 agreement. And Qualcomm -- the Qualcomm ALA does not  
14:21:18 9 provide licensing coverage for the products in question.

14:21:21 10 There is more reference to this, there is at  
14:21:23 11 least five or six references throughout their pleading. In  
14:21:26 12 the most recent pleading at DI 318, they repeal all these.  
14:21:32 13 The breach of the Qualcomm ALA, it's not an issue in the  
14:21:35 14 case in terms of it's not on the verdict form that they have  
14:21:38 15 sought a breach of the Qualcomm ALA, but we have asked for a  
14:21:42 16 determination that our products are covered by the Qualcomm  
14:21:44 17 ALA, that is on our proposed verdict form.

14:21:48 18 And in response to that, there have been  
14:21:50 19 repeated allegations that the Qualcomm ALA has been breached  
14:21:55 20 by Qualcomm. The letter on October 22nd is actually not new  
14:21:59 21 news in the sense of alleging these breaches. It has been  
14:22:03 22 in the case squarely and we anticipate that it is going to  
14:22:07 23 be raised by ARM in response to the arguments that we have  
14:22:09 24 regarding the fact that our products are licensed.

14:22:12 25 In addition, most recently at the pretrial order

14:22:15 1 that was filed, in Exhibit 2 at paragraph 16, ARM confirms  
14:22:23 2 that one of the issues that remains to be litigated is  
14:22:26 3 whether Qualcomm's ALA provides a license to the technology  
14:22:30 4 developed by NuVia prior to the acquisition, and then at  
14:22:35 5 Exhibit 13 of the pretrial order in plaintiff's statement of  
14:22:39 6 intended proofs, there are numerous paragraphs talking at  
14:22:42 7 length about the Qualcomm ALA, the scope of the ALA. In  
14:22:49 8 addition -- the paragraphs for reference, it's 25, 26, 27 --

14:22:54 9 THE COURT: But help me out, I don't understand  
14:22:57 10 the scheme. You want to say look, you're not saying we  
14:23:05 11 didn't -- you're saying we didn't breach because whatever,  
14:23:12 12 and then you're saying but we're licensed? How is you being  
14:23:22 13 licensed under a separate agreement a defense to whether  
14:23:26 14 Qualcomm breached or NuVia breached the original agreement?

14:23:30 15 MS. NYARADY: Well, Qualcomm and NuVia obviously  
14:23:33 16 are separate parties.

14:23:34 17 THE COURT: I know, I know, please don't tell me  
14:23:36 18 that. I get it. I'm not that dumb. I got it.

14:23:39 19 MS. NYARADY: The issue, Your Honor, is the fact  
14:23:41 20 that ARM has taken the position that Qualcomm is selling  
14:23:45 21 unlicensed products currently. And so the response to that  
14:23:51 22 has been that we are licensed under the Qualcomm ALA, we are  
14:23:54 23 allowed to take the technology from NuVia under the Qualcomm  
14:23:58 24 ALA and work with that technology as we've done.

14:24:03 25 THE COURT: They're arguing that part of the

14:24:04 1 breach is that you all, whichever party, was supposed to  
14:24:10 2 destroy everything and didn't, and the defense is well,  
14:24:20 3 we're licensed to have it, so we didn't have to destroy it?

14:24:24 4 MS. NYARADY: Yes, Your Honor, I think that's  
14:24:26 5 part of it. That we got the material under the Qualcomm ALA  
14:24:31 6 pre-termination and we're licensed under the Qualcomm ALA,  
14:24:34 7 these are not unlicensed products. We also importantly,  
14:24:38 8 Your Honor, have an unclean hands defense.

14:24:40 9 THE COURT: That's not going before the jury,  
14:24:43 10 though, right? Isn't that an equitable defense?

14:24:48 11 MS. NYARADY: I think there is a question as to  
14:24:51 12 the full scope of what's going to the jury.

14:24:53 13 THE COURT: When are you going to decide that?  
14:24:55 14 We're at the pretrial conference.

14:24:57 15 Let her finish this one and then I'll let you go  
14:25:01 16 to that. But yeah, okay.

14:25:04 17 MS. NYARADY: But there are allegations  
14:25:06 18 regarding why ARM refused, for example, to give consent to  
14:25:10 19 the acquisition, and again, you know, we've said this  
14:25:17 20 before, but part of the motivation was getting out from  
14:25:20 21 under the Qualcomm ALA. So the Qualcomm ALA has been  
14:25:24 22 intertwined with a number of issues that are directly  
14:25:27 23 relevant.

14:25:27 24 THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to grant this  
14:25:30 25 motion in limine. No other parties can assert that the

14:25:35 1 other one breached the Qualcomm ALA. The October 22nd  
14:25:42 2 letter defendants claim is relevant to show ARM's scheme but  
14:25:47 3 it seems more prejudicial and confusing than helpful. So I  
14:25:53 4 am not going to allow that. That being said, I don't think  
14:25:58 5 that that ruling precludes defendants from arguing that the  
14:26:04 6 products are licensed. Right? There is no -- just make  
14:26:09 7 sure I'm not misunderstanding my ruling.

14:26:12 8 MS. NYARADY: I would agree that your ruling  
14:26:13 9 does not impact our ability to argue that the products are  
14:26:15 10 licensed.

14:26:16 11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. So  
14:26:18 12 that is my ruling on plaintiff's motion in limine number 2.  
14:26:22 13 And Ms. Dunn, if you want to tell me about unclean hands  
14:26:26 14 just to get that out of the way, that's fine.

14:26:28 15 MS. DUNN: So, Your Honor, I am prepared to  
14:26:32 16 address an issue that came up in the pretrial order draft  
14:26:37 17 which is this issue of whether ARM says that we have DJ  
14:26:45 18 claims that are equitable. Our view is they are not  
14:26:49 19 equitable and there is a lot of law on this. It's not been  
14:26:52 20 briefed before Your Honor, there is Supreme Court precedent,  
14:26:55 21 Third Circuit precedent. I'm very happy to speak about this  
14:26:59 22 today, but Your Honor may want --

14:27:00 23 THE COURT: You can give me three pages and they  
14:27:03 24 can respond in three pages, that's it.

14:27:05 25 MS. DUNN: We're happy to do that.

14:27:07 1 THE COURT: How many issues are there?

14:27:11 2 MS. DUNN: Well, we moved for a declaratory  
14:27:14 3 judgment on five issues.

14:27:21 4 THE COURT: What are the issues that you have a  
14:27:22 5 dispute as to whether they're equitable or they're going to  
14:27:26 6 the jury? I don't care about --

14:27:29 7 MS. DUNN: I think all of them, although I'm not  
14:27:32 8 sure this has been discussed about granularity with the  
14:27:37 9 parties.

14:27:37 10 THE COURT: You have three pages to convince me.  
14:27:40 11 You need to talk about it first. And you need to get it to  
14:27:43 12 my Friday, your part, and you can respond by Monday.

14:27:45 13 MS. DURIE: Okay.

14:27:47 14 MS. DUNN: Yes, Your Honor.

14:27:48 15 THE COURT: Plaintiff's motion in limine number  
14:27:50 16 3 seeks to exclude evidence relating to the nature, scope,  
14:27:55 17 or amount of royalties paid by defendants to ARM under the  
14:27:59 18 Qualcomm TLA. ARM says those royalties are irrelevant to  
14:28:06 19 the breach issues and defendants want to use the TLA royalty  
14:28:10 20 to show ARM's motive behind the case, that it wants more  
14:28:14 21 money and they also want to use it as part of their defense.

14:28:17 22 So can someone tell me, I tried to figure out  
14:28:22 23 from looking at those contracts what these royalties are, I  
14:28:25 24 think you just left off schedules or something because I  
14:28:28 25 don't know. So what are we talking about here?

14:28:32 1 MR. OLSON: So we're talking about royalties  
14:28:38 2 that are paid by Qualcomm to ARM --

14:28:41 3 THE COURT: How much?

14:28:42 4 MR. OLSON: There are in the neighborhood of [REDACTED]

14:28:47 5 [REDACTED] But they involve only what are called the TLAs,  
14:28:53 6 and they involve products, none of which are in this case,  
14:28:57 7 and involve cores that are licensed by ARM to Qualcomm, none  
14:29:03 8 of which are in this case. So what happens with a series of  
14:29:09 9 older products, not in this case, ARM has licensed to  
14:29:15 10 Qualcomm fully developed completed CPU cores, that  
14:29:26 11 technology, Qualcomm has taken those cores and put them in  
14:29:30 12 certain products. None of those products where they did  
14:29:32 13 that are in this case. And after they put them in and sell  
14:29:35 14 those, they then pay ARM a royalty under the TLA for that  
14:29:42 15 fully developed core that they took and put in. Different  
14:29:45 16 than the ALA, it's not about an ALA, it's not about that at  
14:29:50 17 all.

14:29:50 18 And the very specific concern that we have is  
14:29:53 19 that the defendants will say we're paying [REDACTED] in  
14:29:59 20 royalties to you guys and that will create a prejudice and  
14:30:05 21 ambiguity in the jury's mind as to whether or not we are  
14:30:08 22 already being compensated for the activities that are at  
14:30:14 23 issue in this case and there is zero doubt, there is zero  
14:30:17 24 dispute that the royalties that are being paid and the  
14:30:20 25 amounts involved have nothing to do with the items that are

14:30:24 1 in this case.

14:30:25 2 Now, defendants separately want to argue that  
14:30:30 3 the differential in royalty rates, for example, between the  
14:30:34 4 NuVia ALA and -- which was higher than the Qualcomm ALA was  
14:30:39 5 a motivation to request consent or deny consent with respect  
14:30:45 6 to the activities. And they make claims about the  
14:30:49 7 differential in rates as it applies to the ALA's and the  
14:30:54 8 TLAs. To be frank, we don't think that that is nearly as  
14:30:58 9 prejudicial as a statement outstanding which I think is  
14:31:03 10 severely prejudicial that we're paying you a lot of money  
14:31:08 11 already, we're your big partner, we give you, you know, [REDACTED]  
14:31:14 12 [REDACTED] whatever the number will be, and effectively  
14:31:17 13 implying or suggesting that we've already been compensated  
14:31:21 14 because there is no doubt that's not true.

14:31:22 15 Even the differential between the ALA's and the  
14:31:26 16 TLAs we think is irrelevant and prejudicial. The question  
14:31:30 17 of motivation is sufficiently shown by the fact that the  
14:31:33 18 NuVia ALA if it's relevant at all, which we've already  
14:31:37 19 indicated we don't think it's relevant, if it's relevant at  
14:31:40 20 all, the differential between the NuVia ALA which is  
14:31:43 21 [REDACTED] more than the Qualcomm ALA, is  
14:31:49 22 more than sufficient, but the reference to prior large  
14:31:53 23 amounts being transferred for other technology in other  
14:31:59 24 business arrangements for other products involving other  
14:32:02 25 cores none of which are in this case we think should be

14:32:05 1 excluded.

14:32:12 2 MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, I want to make it very  
14:32:18 3 clear that defendants are not going to argue that ARM has  
14:32:22 4 already been compensated for the conduct at issue in this  
14:32:26 5 litigation through those TLA payments.

14:32:29 6 I would like to correct the record, though, when  
14:32:31 7 Mr. Olson says that the TLA has nothing to do with the  
14:32:36 8 products in the case, payments under the TLA. That is  
14:32:40 9 incorrect. The products in this case actually have a  
14:32:43 10 royalty under the ALA and the TLA. So the TLA is relevant  
14:32:50 11 in that regard.

14:32:50 12 But to be very clear, not only do we not intend  
14:32:54 13 to imply that, we have on our witness -- I'm sorry, our  
14:32:59 14 exhibit list, royalty credit memos that show that we have  
14:33:04 15 tried to pay for the current products in the lawsuit under  
14:33:08 16 the Qualcomm ALA, and so we are affirmatively going to put  
14:33:13 17 in evidence that will resolve any of the concern that's been  
14:33:17 18 raised by ARM in terms of, you know, misleading the jury or  
14:33:20 19 confusing the jury. We are not going to say that any of  
14:33:23 20 these payments that have been made somehow, you know,  
14:33:27 21 satisfy payments that should be made with respect to these  
14:33:30 22 products.

14:33:31 23 Now with respect to the relevance of the TLA  
14:33:36 24 payments, it seems to us that ARM is really attempting to  
14:33:41 25 tell half the story, if you will, of the relationship

14:33:44 1 between the parties. We are going to be -- Qualcomm is  
14:33:48 2 going to be accused of acting in bad faith. We think the  
14:33:53 3 TLA payments and the performance under the TLA for all  
14:33:56 4 products across the Ecosystem show that Qualcomm is acting  
14:34:00 5 in good faith under the agreements, that in combination with  
14:34:03 6 our attempts to pay for all the products even in the lawsuit  
14:34:06 7 under our agreements go to that argument. So we want to  
14:34:09 8 show the entire relationship between the parties.

14:34:11 9 This is also in ARM's statement of facts and  
14:34:15 10 issues for trial. They talk about the long-standing  
14:34:18 11 relationship and the interaction, both sides have referenced  
14:34:23 12 the fact that Qualcomm is the largest customer of ARM, and  
14:34:26 13 the TLA payments are evidence of the depth of the  
14:34:31 14 relationship between the parties and the ongoing performance  
14:34:33 15 by Qualcomm. We think they're directly relevant to issues  
14:34:37 16 that are in the case.

14:34:39 17 In addition as we said in our brief, there will  
14:34:43 18 be evidence regarding the calculations that were done by ARM  
14:34:50 19 about the difference between the AIA and the TLA amounts,  
14:34:55 20 the royalty assessment. In fact, on the very day that ARM  
14:34:59 21 learned about the acquisition, there are documents showing  
14:35:02 22 that they went and immediately did this calculation.

14:35:05 23 We are going to be talking at trial about the  
14:35:08 24 work that's done by NuVia and by Qualcomm to develop these  
14:35:12 25 products and innovate. The difference in rates between the

14:35:15 1 TLA and the ALA is evidence of that because under the TLA,  
14:35:19 2 as Mr. Olson said, products are provided that are more fully  
14:35:24 3 formed. And so what a TLA licensee gets versus what an ARM  
14:35:30 4 -- sorry, an ALA licensee gets are going to be at issue in  
14:35:34 5 the case and we're going to be talking a lot about the  
14:35:38 6 innovative work that was done by NuVia and Qualcomm to  
14:35:41 7 develop these products and build these products under the  
14:35:44 8 ALA, so the difference in the ratings to that as well, and  
14:35:48 9 it does demonstrate the difference in the value of what is  
14:35:51 10 obtained by a licensee under these different agreements.

14:35:54 11 Also I would point out, Your Honor, that in the  
14:36:01 12 pretrial order at Exhibit 13, where ARM set forth its  
14:36:06 13 intended proofs, it talks about again in paragraph 41 the  
14:36:10 14 long-standing business relationships that it has with its  
14:36:14 15 licensee and how trust and integrity are an important part  
14:36:18 16 of that.

14:36:18 17 In paragraph 114 it talks about the impact of  
14:36:21 18 relationships with licensees. In paragraph 115 and  
14:36:26 19 elsewhere, it talks about the ecosystem, it calls it the  
14:36:31 20 ecosystem of the ARM-based devices. That ecosystem includes  
14:36:35 21 all of the products that are under the Qualcomm TLA. And  
14:36:38 22 there repeated references in the record --

14:36:42 23 THE COURT: I think I have heard enough. All  
14:36:44 24 right. So I have ARM's motion in limine number 3. It's  
14:36:49 25 going to be granted in part and denied in part. Granted to

14:36:52 1 the extent that the amount of money already paid under the  
14:36:57 2 ALA for products other than the current products at issue, I  
14:37:00 3 think that is not relevant. Denied as to the different  
14:37:03 4 royalty rates which appear to be relevant to defendants'  
14:37:06 5 defense that ARM wrongfully withheld consent to transfer the  
14:37:10 6 NuVia ALA to Qualcomm because ARM was dissatisfied with the  
14:37:14 7 lower royalty rate it would receive.

14:37:16 8 All right.

14:37:17 9 MS. NYARADY: Thank you, Your Honor.

14:37:18 10 THE COURT: Now we get to Qualcomm -- maybe this  
14:37:20 11 is you, Ms. Nyrady, Qualcomm's motion in limine number 1.

14:37:26 12 MR. BLUMENFELD: With the Court's permission,  
14:37:28 13 Mr. Braly is going to address that.

14:37:31 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

14:37:34 15 MR. BRALY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jacob  
14:37:36 16 Braly on behalf of defendants.

14:37:38 17 What we seek here in this motion in limine is to  
14:37:41 18 exclude testimony and evidence regarding the specific dollar  
14:37:45 19 amount of proceeds that the NuVia founders received during  
14:37:49 20 the NuVia acquisition. This evidence is irrelevant to the  
14:37:54 21 claims at issue, and any potential relevance is  
14:37:59 22 substantially outweighed by the likelihood of prejudice or  
14:38:02 23 bias from a jury under 403.

14:38:05 24 To be clear, we are not seeking to exclude  
14:38:08 25 evidence related to the acquisition price, to the fact that

14:38:11 1 the founders received compensation in the acquisition, or to  
14:38:15 2 the fact that there is a bonus structure laid out and a term  
14:38:20 3 sheet that was signed as part of the acquisition. All of  
14:38:23 4 the reasons that ARM provides in their response are  
14:38:27 5 satisfied without disclosing the actual proceeds that were  
14:38:31 6 made by the NuVia founders who are nonparties to this  
14:38:36 7 action. And including that information and introducing that  
14:38:39 8 evidence into this case would only seek to inflame the jury.

14:38:42 9 To also address one of the issues that's raised  
14:38:45 10 in ARM's response, they question whether a particular  
14:38:50 11 milestone -- I think the last pending milestone payment was  
14:38:53 12 paid out based on --

14:38:55 13 THE COURT: How much money are we talking about?  
14:38:59 14 MR. BRALY: It is approximately 80 to \$100  
14:39:03 15 million, Your Honor. Mr. Gulati in Exhibit 1A to our  
14:39:08 16 opening brief provides a breakdown of the amount on pages  
14:39:11 17 137 to 138, and describes both the stock transfer as well as  
14:39:17 18 a cash payment and then, of course, there are milestone  
14:39:20 19 payments as well.

14:39:22 20 THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from the  
14:39:24 21 plaintiff.

14:39:25 22 MS. DURIE: Thank you, Your Honor. Daralyn  
14:39:30 23 Durie for ARM.

14:39:31 24 Evidence of the amount of money that the  
14:39:34 25 founders stood to make by virtue of the acquisition is

14:39:39 1 highly relevant to their motivation for disregarding their  
14:39:45 2 contractual obligations. And closing that transaction  
14:39:50 3 notwithstanding the consent requirement and failing to get  
14:39:54 4 consent, and then using the ARM technology that had been  
14:40:01 5 developed at NuVia in order to speed product development at  
14:40:06 6 Qualcomm and get the milestone payments that had been  
14:40:10 7 promised to them. And I think the case law is quite clear  
14:40:14 8 that evidence of the amount of money that a party stands to  
14:40:19 9 gain is evidence of bias. And it shows their motivation for  
14:40:24 10 engaging in the specific conduct that is at issue in this  
14:40:28 11 case.

14:40:28 12 THE COURT: All right. I think I have heard  
14:40:30 13 enough.

14:40:30 14 MS. DURIE: Thank you.

14:40:31 15 THE COURT: I am going to deny the motion. If  
14:40:38 16 defendants -- I've already permitted defendants to use the  
14:40:40 17 royalty rate to show motive and bias from plaintiff's part,  
14:40:45 18 then plaintiff can also use Qualcomm's buyout figures to  
14:40:49 19 show motive or bias of the NuVia folks.

14:40:53 20 Okay. Qualcomm's motion in limine number 2,  
14:40:58 21 defendants seek to preclude ARM from making arguments about  
14:41:01 22 its ALA program, ALAs generally unless it produces all of  
14:41:07 23 its third-party ALAs without redactions. We had a little  
14:41:11 24 bit of a discussion about this at the last hearing. I'm not  
14:41:16 25 sure if I screwed that up. So I do need to understand

14:41:19 1 what's going on because plaintiff now seems to be saying  
14:41:26 2 look, we're not going to use those, which I appreciate  
14:41:30 3 because you didn't produce them, you shouldn't be able to  
14:41:33 4 use them.

14:41:34 5 But what I'm not sure happens is instead it  
14:41:37 6 seems like you're saying we're just going to have people  
14:41:40 7 testify. Well, what are you going to have them testify?  
14:41:43 8 Are you going to have them testify about things that they  
14:41:45 9 need those documents to cross-examine them on, or are you  
14:41:48 10 going to testify about stuff that you've already produced  
14:41:52 11 discovery on? So that is what I need some help on.

14:41:55 12 MS. DURIE: Thank you. And the answer, Your  
14:41:57 13 Honor, is the latter. So we will have witnesses describe at  
14:42:03 14 a high level the ALA program, and that there are ALA's with  
14:42:11 15 a number of different companies. That I think is not a  
14:42:13 16 contested fact. We do not intend to put in any evidence  
14:42:17 17 about the specific terms of specific agreements that would  
14:42:22 18 implicate in any way any information that was redacted from  
14:42:27 19 those agreements.

14:42:28 20 The only -- the reason that this evidence is  
14:42:32 21 relevant is to show -- in part to show harm. Obviously the  
14:42:38 22 details of that harm are for the remedies phase for a  
14:42:43 23 specific performance, but Qualcomm has taken the position  
14:42:46 24 that we need to show as an element of the breach of contract  
14:42:50 25 claim harm from the breach.

14:42:51 1 THE COURT: And I agree with that.

14:42:52 2 MS. DURIE: Right. And so we intend to have

14:42:56 3 testimony both that ARM is harmed by the unlicensed use of

14:43:00 4 our technology by Qualcomm and not being compensated for

14:43:06 5 that use in the way that they believe they should have been,

14:43:10 6 and that there is harm generally to ARM from the unlicensed

14:43:15 7 use of its technology, this is not the only ALA.

14:43:19 8 THE COURT: But I need to know specifically what

14:43:23 9 you suggest someone is going to testify about because if

14:43:25 10 that person is going to say well, gosh, it affects our

14:43:30 11 ability to negotiate good prices on other ALA's, that seems

14:43:34 12 like something you should have produced.

14:43:36 13 MS. DURIE: I understand. We are not going to

14:43:39 14 have witness testimony that there has been any past

14:43:44 15 impairment in our ability to negotiate specific ALA terms

14:43:49 16 including rates. We do think that to the extent that

14:43:55 17 Qualcomm's conduct was blessed here and that Qualcomm was

14:44:00 18 ultimately permitted to use unlicensed technology, that that

14:44:06 19 would have negative consequences going forward, but we're

14:44:10 20 not going to put in any testimony --

14:44:13 21 THE COURT: How is that showing damages? That's

14:44:16 22 showing speculative stuff for the future. How is that

14:44:19 23 showing that you have been damaged by the breach?

14:44:22 24 MS. DURIE: I think there is exigent harm to the

14:44:26 25 licensing ecosystem, but I think for purposes of showing

14:44:30 1 harm as an element of the breach of contract claim, the fact  
14:44:34 2 that our technology is being used in an unlicensed fashion  
14:44:39 3 without compensation, without in our view adequate  
14:44:42 4 compensation --

14:44:43 5 THE COURT: That one I understood. I understood  
14:44:45 6 that one. I don't understand you saying and now we're going  
14:44:50 7 to put someone up and he's not going to say we've already  
14:44:53 8 been harmed because we couldn't negotiate better deals or  
14:44:57 9 people were like you let Qualcomm get away with it, so we  
14:45:03 10 can get away with paying less or something, you're not going  
14:45:06 11 to do that and instead you want him to say well, it may  
14:45:09 12 happen in the future, that doesn't seem like harm for a  
14:45:12 13 breach of contract. That seems kind of speculative and  
14:45:18 14 future.

14:45:18 15 MS. DURIE: I don't disagree that it is about  
14:45:20 16 the future. It is about why this lawsuit is important to  
14:45:23 17 ARM, it is about why ARM made the decision which was as I  
14:45:28 18 understand it literally unprecedented to sue one of its  
14:45:32 19 licensees for the unlicensed use of its technology.

14:45:37 20 I agree that is not what we will be relying on,  
14:45:40 21 it is the predicate for a determination of harm as an  
14:45:44 22 element of a breach of contract claim, I believe that is the  
14:45:47 23 harm that will be specific from the unlicensed use of this  
14:45:50 24 technology.

14:45:50 25 THE COURT: Let me ask you a question because it

14:45:53 1 sort of your explanation kind of raised this which is let's  
14:45:59 2 say you go before the jury and the jury says there was a  
14:46:04 3 breach, and the damage, there was damage and loss of  
14:46:10 4 reputation, something like that. Okay? Something that's  
14:46:13 5 damages, but that is sufficient to show damages for purposes  
14:46:18 6 of making out a breach of contract claim. And then you come  
14:46:22 7 to me and you've already just said part of your damage may  
14:46:27 8 be that you're not compensated adequately for the breach,  
14:46:32 9 for the use of our technology, so it's using your technology  
14:46:36 10 but not compensating you adequately.

14:46:39 11 So let's just say after I hear you out on that I  
14:46:42 12 say it doesn't seem to me that there is no adequate monetary  
14:46:47 13 relief. What happens because there has been no request for  
14:46:53 14 damages, and if I don't give you specific performance but  
14:46:56 15 there is a breach, where are we?

14:46:59 16 MS. DURIE: So the Court has the power in equity  
14:47:04 17 to make awards incidental to an equitable request for  
14:47:10 18 specific performance.

14:47:14 19 THE COURT: Did you ask for that in the pretrial  
14:47:16 20 order?

14:47:16 21 MS. DURIE: We asked for that in the pleadings  
14:47:18 22 and I believe it is in the pretrial order as well.

14:47:21 23 I do want to make clear that what I have been  
14:47:24 24 talking about is harm as an element of a breach of contract  
14:47:27 25 claim as distinct from damages.

14:47:29 1 THE COURT: I understand. But if you're going  
14:47:31 2 to convince me -- if you want to tell the jury that our harm  
14:47:36 3 is that we haven't been adequately compensated, I can't  
14:47:41 4 pretend that I didn't hear that. Compensation sounds  
14:47:44 5 money-ish.

14:47:45 6 MS. DURIE: I understand, and that is an element  
14:47:46 7 of harm and I understand Your Honor's point. So the answer  
14:47:49 8 to your question I think is remedies that are incidental to  
14:47:54 9 specific performance.

14:47:55 10 THE COURT: All right.

14:47:56 11 MS. DURIE: Thank you.

14:47:56 12 THE COURT: Mr. Blumenfeld, did we help with  
14:47:59 13 some of that? So they're not going to put in ALA's, they're  
14:48:04 14 not going to testify that anything -- that there was  
14:48:10 15 anything in the past where they -- their negotiations or  
14:48:13 16 their ALA's were somehow impacted, and that's damages. I'm  
14:48:21 17 not sure I'm going to let them put in something speculative  
14:48:25 18 about the future, while maybe this will happen, maybe it  
14:48:29 19 won't. So that leaves us with an argument that they're not  
14:48:35 20 being adequately compensated for their -- for the alleged  
14:48:41 21 breach. That seems like it's outside of this motion in  
14:48:45 22 limine. So what is left of the motion in limine that I need  
14:48:49 23 to address?

14:48:51 24 MR. BLUMENFELD: So a couple of things, Your  
14:48:53 25 Honor, and I want to swing back to the damages issue that

14:48:55 1 you raised with Ms. Durie. I don't think it's correct that  
14:49:02 2 all they intend to do is call some executives and say oh,  
14:49:06 3 there may be some harm to us in the future which Your Honor  
14:49:11 4 has said you haven't decided whether you will let them do  
14:49:15 5 that or not. This came up a little bit during summary  
14:49:18 6 judgment where they put in a declaration from two of the  
14:49:20 7 executives. In fact, if you read their MIL response it  
14:49:24 8 specifically says --

14:49:25 9 THE COURT: That caught my attention in the MIL,  
14:49:29 10 we're going to have somebody testify and I'm like okay,  
14:49:32 11 about what.

14:49:33 12 MR. BLUMENFELD: It says about royalties that  
14:49:36 13 have been decreased. That doesn't sound like the future,  
14:49:38 14 that sounds like --

14:49:39 15 THE COURT: I understand, but we've now had a  
14:49:44 16 representation that suggest that's not going to happen,  
14:49:46 17 unless the royalties that have been decreased means that  
14:49:49 18 they're not being paid, they're Qualcomm or NuVia royalties  
14:49:55 19 that they're not getting paid.

14:49:56 20 MR. BLUMENFELD: Right. If I could hand up one  
14:49:59 21 of the declarations they put in, this is a big part of our  
14:50:02 22 concern. It's from Williamson. It came in in August, we  
14:50:06 23 objected to it as part of the summary judgment proceedings  
14:50:09 24 because it is speculative, and also because it does disclose  
14:50:25 25 things or argues things that we didn't get discovery of

14:50:29 1 because we didn't get the ALA's in for other reasons. But  
14:50:33 2 if you look at Mr. Williamson's declaration, and he is  
14:50:38 3 listed as a trial witness, so he's senior vice-president and  
14:50:42 4 general manager, and he says in paragraph 6 that the  
14:50:51 5 unlicensed use of ARM's technology has caused multiple harms  
14:50:55 6 to ARM. And then he goes on to explain that, and in  
14:50:59 7 paragraph 7, he says based on my experience at ARM and  
14:51:03 8 marketing and business roles since 2015, the industry's  
14:51:08 9 perception of ARM's reputation and its ability to protect  
14:51:12 10 its intellectual property impacts ARM's contracts with its  
14:51:15 11 licensees, for example, it affects the terms that ARM's  
14:51:19 12 licensees are willing to accept, their proposals during  
14:51:23 13 negotiations, their willingness to comply with those issues.  
14:51:26 14 Terms that may be impacted include that products are  
14:51:29 15 licensed financial terms, scope of license technology, I  
14:51:34 16 don't know how I'm supposed to be able to cross-examine him  
14:51:37 17 on these things happen when I'm talking to our licensees, by  
14:51:41 18 the way, you don't have the licenses so you can't use them  
14:51:44 19 to cross-examine me --

14:51:47 20 THE COURT: Hold on. Let me ask. Ms. Durie, I  
14:51:51 21 would have thought based on our representations you weren't  
14:51:53 22 planning to have him do that because I kind of agree,  
14:51:57 23 Mr. Blumenfeld can't just say --

14:52:00 24 MS. DURIE: That is correct, we are not going to  
14:52:02 25 say that there have been any such impacts to date.

14:52:06 1 THE COURT: But you want him to say but there  
14:52:11 2 will be.

14:52:12 3 MS. DURIE: I would like for him to be able to  
14:52:15 4 say that one of the reasons that ARM brought this case is  
14:52:20 5 because its licensee ecosystem is extremely important to it  
14:52:28 6 and it is very important to ARM as an IP licensing entity  
14:52:32 7 that its licensees respect its intellectual property. And  
14:52:38 8 that in ARM's view, if Qualcomm were able to use ARM  
14:52:42 9 technology in an unlicensed fashion, that could have very  
14:52:46 10 severe downstream consequences for ARM. I don't expect  
14:52:50 11 anyone to spend a long time belaboring the point.

14:52:53 12 I think at that high level, they are -- Qualcomm  
14:52:57 13 has said that they are going to try to suggest that ARM's  
14:53:01 14 reasons for refusing to consent and bringing the case was  
14:53:06 15 because it wanted to get rid of the Qualcomm ALA. Our  
14:53:10 16 response to that is to say no, that is not true, the reason  
14:53:14 17 that we are here is not because we want to get rid of the  
14:53:17 18 Qualcomm ALA, the reason that we are here is because  
14:53:20 19 Qualcomm is using our technology in an unlicensed fashion  
14:53:23 20 and that is important to us.

14:53:24 21 But we don't intend to belabor the point and we  
14:53:28 22 do not intend to make any argument that there has been any  
14:53:31 23 specific effect in any specific license agreement that would  
14:53:34 24 give rise to the need to cross-examine on that.

14:53:38 25 THE COURT: So with that --

14:53:40 1 MR. BLUMENFELD: Your Honor, if you go on to --  
14:53:42 2 I want to respond also to her point about motivation, how it  
14:53:46 3 is their motivation. The suit gets in after, what Mr. Olson  
14:53:50 4 said, after our motivation.

14:53:52 5 THE COURT: I know. Well, you are going to talk  
14:53:55 6 about their motivation to sue, that's all I heard over here  
14:53:58 7 is they're suing us because they want more money so I can  
14:54:02 8 sort of see why they get to respond and say no, we're not  
14:54:05 9 suing them because we want more money, we're suing them  
14:54:09 10 because this is harmful to our business model.

14:54:12 11 MR. BLUMENFELD: Well, we will get to that  
14:54:15 12 undoubtedly when things come up at trial, but on the  
14:54:18 13 specific things that Ms. Durie said about what they're going  
14:54:22 14 to do, if you turn to paragraph 11 and then paragraph 13 of  
14:54:27 15 Mr. Williamson's declaration, he says he --

14:54:30 16 THE COURT: Yeah, let's just check before you  
14:54:33 17 tell me, are you going -- this seems like past stuff, since  
14:54:38 18 June people have contacted me and I have been damaged. So  
14:54:43 19 we need -- you're not going to put this in.

14:54:46 20 MS. DURIE: That's correct, Your Honor.

14:54:47 21 THE COURT: Okay. So that was paragraph 11.

14:54:50 22 MS. DURIE: Paragraph 11, that's right.

14:54:52 23 THE COURT: And then --

14:54:53 24 MS. DURIE: I want to be clear, we're talking  
14:54:55 25 about the phase in front of the jury, obviously specific

14:54:58 1 performance is a separate question and we'll address that at  
14:55:01 2 a separate time in front of Your Honor.

14:55:04 3 THE COURT: We can do that, I'm just saying the  
14:55:06 4 extent that you want him to say I have been contacted by  
14:55:09 5 people and our agreements are suffering, I would have  
14:55:14 6 expected that all of that underlying stuff be produced, and  
14:55:19 7 that you're not just going to have him get up there and say  
14:55:24 8 it and leave Mr. Blumenfeld to say I don't know if that's  
14:55:28 9 true or not. So you can ask again to put it in if there is  
14:55:33 10 a bench trial phase, but I still in a bench trial require  
14:55:40 11 you to disclose stuff during discovery.

14:55:43 12 All right. What about paragraph 12, did you  
14:55:46 13 have a problem with paragraph 12, Mr. Blumenfeld? This is  
14:55:51 14 -- that's different, that's Qualcomm's position as to what's  
14:55:54 15 licensed.

14:55:55 16 MR. BLUMENFELD: It's 13, that's the other  
14:55:56 17 issue. But on this entire subject, I don't -- so they put  
14:56:02 18 in a declaration saying I have talked to our partners, I  
14:56:06 19 have talked to our licensees, here is what I have learned  
14:56:09 20 from them. They say that in the declaration. They're not  
14:56:12 21 going to do that at trial. I don't know how he can get on  
14:56:15 22 the stand and just say but this is going to happen.

14:56:18 23 THE COURT: And I haven't quite gotten through  
14:56:23 24 that. I understand that concern. I understand that  
14:56:26 25 concern. And I'm not -- but I guess what I'm thinking is I

14:56:33 1 need to understand more of what he's going to say, right?  
14:56:37 2 Like, why can't he get up there and say this is our whole  
14:56:41 3 business model, our business model is we licensed  
14:56:45 4 technology, and you know, if you're going to be out there --  
14:56:47 5 and we think we have great technology. But it's important  
14:56:50 6 to us that people respect our licenses because if people  
14:56:54 7 don't respect our licenses, our business model is not worth  
14:56:57 8 the paper that it's written on. Right?

14:56:59 9 MS. DURIE: Right.

14:56:59 10 THE COURT: And then he can say and our  
14:57:05 11 perception is that Qualcomm or NuVia, or I know there is two  
14:57:10 12 different parties, I don't know who I'm talking about at  
14:57:12 13 this moment, but you don't have to tell me there is two  
14:57:16 14 different parties, whoever is not respecting our licenses,  
14:57:19 15 probably both, right, neither of them respected the license  
14:57:22 16 according to the plaintiff. So that seems okay to me and  
14:57:26 17 that's not speculative damages, that's saying it's important  
14:57:30 18 to us that people respect it, and it's important to our  
14:57:34 19 business model that people respect it, and they're not  
14:57:37 20 respecting it. And you can say well, you don't have any  
14:57:40 21 evidence that it actually had an impact, but why can't he  
14:57:44 22 get up there and say, come on, we're a licensing company,  
14:57:47 23 all we do is enter agreements and if we say everybody can  
14:57:51 24 just kind of pooh pooh our agreements, you know, it doesn't  
14:57:55 25 -- the jury can look at that and be like well, that sounds

14:57:58 1 **bad.**

14:58:00 2 MR. BLUMENFELD: So here is the problem with  
14:58:02 3 that, and it goes to the question Your Honor raised with  
14:58:05 4 Ms. Durie. How do I cross-examine him? Because, for  
14:58:09 5 example, we know that they've entered into other licenses  
14:58:13 6 since the termination of the NuVia license. We all know  
14:58:17 7 about Apple and there are others they've entered into since  
14:58:21 8 then. We don't have them, or we have them in redacted forms  
14:58:26 9 that we don't know what the terms are. We went through that  
14:58:30 10 back in March with the Google licenses where the terms are  
14:58:33 11 totally redacted. So if he gets on the stand and says this  
14:58:37 12 is going to affect our licensing program, it's going to  
14:58:40 13 affect our ability to collect royalties, it's going to  
14:58:43 14 affect people's willingness to take a license and all I can  
14:58:46 15 say is well, people took licenses, right, and I don't have  
14:58:51 16 those licenses and I can't cross-examine him on whether the  
14:58:55 17 harm is real or whether it's just something he's making up  
14:58:59 18 for the jury.

14:58:59 19 THE COURT: Let me ask Ms. Durie on that  
14:59:02 20 specific point because that one seems --

14:59:04 21 MS. DURIE: So we're not arguing that there has  
14:59:06 22 been any affect on any exigent license agreements because  
14:59:11 23 the harm hasn't happened yet --

14:59:13 24 THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. If he's going to  
14:59:16 25 get up there and say well, it's going to harm us in the

14:59:19 1 future and Mr. Blumenfeld could if he had the agreement say  
14:59:23 2 good of you to say, but by the way, since this all happened,  
14:59:28 3 you have entered into 89 license agreements and, in fact,  
14:59:30 4 you got better terms than you ever had before, that's a  
14:59:34 5 pretty good cross of him saying oh, it's going to now hurt  
14:59:38 6 us.

14:59:39 7 MS. DURIE: So I disagree --

14:59:41 8 THE COURT: Well, I don't --

14:59:43 9 MS. DURIE: But the distinction, I want to draw  
14:59:44 10 the distinction between what will happen as a consequence of  
14:59:48 11 Qualcomm being allowed to use technology in an unlicensed  
14:59:53 12 way without consequences --

14:59:55 13 THE COURT: Yes. According to you -- hold on.

14:59:58 14 MS. DURIE: Yes.

14:59:58 15 THE COURT: According to you, Qualcomm has been  
15:00:01 16 allowed to do this.

15:00:03 17 MS. DURIE: Not yet. We're in court litigating  
15:00:07 18 over that very issue. They have not gotten away with it.  
15:00:11 19 They make -- if they were to get away with it, if this were  
15:00:15 20 to not have a consequence, we would be harmed. But we are  
15:00:18 21 not saying -- there has been no --

15:00:21 22 THE COURT: Now you're getting super  
15:00:24 23 speculative. So the jury has to now assume that the damage  
15:00:28 24 is that they find that there is a breach, but they can't  
15:00:32 25 find that there is a breach unless there is damage. So I

15:00:35 1 can't -- that seemed wrong to me.

15:00:37 2 MS. DURIE: So let me be clear. The allegation  
15:00:40 3 of harm for purposes of whether there was a breach is that  
15:00:43 4 they are using our unlicensed technology and they are not  
15:00:48 5 paying for it. That is harm. And that suffices to show  
15:00:54 6 harm for purposes of a breach.

15:00:56 7 THE COURT: You know what, that's all I'm going  
15:00:59 8 to let him say at trial. He cannot say -- no, he cannot say  
15:01:02 9 and in the future, this is going to cause us problems if the  
15:01:06 10 jury finds that there was a breach and this can all go and  
15:01:11 11 they are allow to get away with it. He cannot say it.  
15:01:14 12 Okay? He cannot say it. You can stop arguing it because  
15:01:20 13 you did not produce -- you did not produce information that  
15:01:26 14 would allow the defendants to fairly cross-examine your  
15:01:31 15 witnesses because I get it, you're saying well, they didn't  
15:01:36 16 get away with it until the jury finds they got away with it.  
15:01:40 17 The fact is they're doing it now. There is no -- no, he  
15:01:43 18 can't -- and so one, no, you didn't produce the documents.  
15:01:47 19 Two, no, it seems awfully speculative to say we think that  
15:01:52 20 at some point if the jury finds that there wasn't -- I don't  
15:01:57 21 even know if the jury finds there was a breach or there  
15:02:00 22 wasn't a breach that we're going to be harmed.

15:02:02 23 MS. DURIE: It's not the jury verdict. Let me  
15:02:05 24 very be very clear, it's why we brought the lawsuit. If we  
15:02:09 25 had allowed this conduct to go unchallenged, if we had

15:02:12 1 allowed Qualcomm to use our IP in an unlicensed fashion and  
15:02:16 2 not take an action, that would have threatened our  
15:02:20 3 ecosystem, the reason we brought --

15:02:22 4 THE COURT: There is a difference between saying  
15:02:24 5 it will threaten our ecosystem and saying, and what that  
15:02:28 6 means is we are going to be harmed in the future by people,  
15:02:35 7 you know, everybody -- no one is going to respect our  
15:02:39 8 licenses. It's one thing if he gets up there and says this  
15:02:42 9 is our business model, we need people to respect our  
15:02:46 10 licenses, they're not respecting our licenses, okay, I don't  
15:02:50 11 know exactly what that establishes, but the jury I suppose  
15:02:54 12 could fairly draw an inference from that. It's a very  
15:02:58 13 different thing for him to say and by the way, we will be  
15:03:01 14 harmed in the future, or we may be harmed in the future if  
15:03:06 15 this is allowed.

15:03:07 16 MS. DURIE: May I just say in response to the  
15:03:09 17 attack on our motive for bringing the lawsuit, which  
15:03:13 18 Qualcomm intends to put at issue by saying we refused to  
15:03:17 19 consent to try to get out from under the Qualcomm ALA, we  
15:03:20 20 would like our witness to be able to say that's not why  
15:03:23 21 we're here, the reason why we're here, why we brought the  
15:03:27 22 lawsuit and why we are insisting on our rights is because we  
15:03:32 23 are a licensing shop. If our technology is used in an  
15:03:35 24 unlicensed fashion, that threatens our entire business model  
15:03:39 25 and we're very concerned about what the consequences of that

15:03:43 1 would be. We're not saying we're harmed by that --

15:03:46 2 THE COURT: Yes, but the problem I have is --

15:03:49 3 and you can say that I'm talking about something different,

15:03:52 4 but I still think it's fair within the scope of

15:03:55 5 cross-examination, if your witness gets up there and says

15:03:58 6 all hell is going to break loose if people don't respect our

15:04:02 7 licenses, our business model is not worth the paper it's

15:04:05 8 written on, and Mr. Blumenfeld or Ms. Dunn or Ms. Nyrady or

15:04:10 9 whoever can't get up and say well, wait a second, everybody

15:04:15 10 knows that according to you, Qualcomm has not been

15:04:20 11 respecting our technology and has just been using it as you

15:04:22 12 say in an unlicensed manner and the sky has not fallen in,

15:04:28 13 in fact all of this other stuff has happened, the problem is

15:04:32 14 he can't say that or they can't say that because you didn't

15:04:35 15 produce the documents.

15:04:36 16 MS. DURIE: I would think, Your Honor, we could

15:04:38 17 arrive at a stipulation to solve that problem because that

15:04:40 18 is not the argument that we are making. We are saying if we

15:04:43 19 had not enforced our rights and just sat on the sidelines

15:04:48 20 and didn't take action to protect our intellectual property

15:04:52 21 and allowed the unlicensed use of our IP without

15:04:57 22 consequence, that is what would threaten our entire model,

15:05:00 23 not being here pursuing this litigation, but sitting on the

15:05:03 24 sidelines and not taking action.

15:05:05 25 If Qualcomm wants to cross-examine our witnesses

15:05:09 1 --

15:05:09 2 THE COURT: How are they supposed to say we  
15:05:11 3 don't believe you, that's not true?

15:05:14 4 MS. DURIE: I think we could work out a  
15:05:15 5 stipulation. If their goal is to be able to establish that  
15:05:19 6 we are not contending there has been any such harm with  
15:05:23 7 respect to the terms of license agreements that we were able  
15:05:27 8 to negotiate in view of the fact that we did file a lawsuit,  
15:05:31 9 we have no problem with that, and I think we could work out  
15:05:34 10 a stipulation to that effect.

15:05:36 11 THE COURT: All right. This is what I am going  
15:05:37 12 to do. You can't use the ALA. It sounds like you don't  
15:05:41 13 want to use the ALA. And you can't use anything that's  
15:05:44 14 happened to date, and it doesn't sound like you want to use  
15:05:47 15 anything that's happened to date. So that I will rule on.  
15:05:55 16 Whatever happens, see if you can come up with a stipulation  
15:05:57 17 that will allow you to deal with it. If not, you can use  
15:06:02 18 some of your trial time to argue the rest of this, whatever  
15:06:05 19 is left of this motion to me.

15:06:07 20 MS. DURIE: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

15:06:09 21 THE COURT: But I understood the motion to be  
15:06:14 22 that defendants seek to preclude ARM from making argument  
15:06:17 23 about its ALA product program and so I guess to the extent  
15:06:21 24 that we're talking about not specific agreements but the  
15:06:26 25 program, then I -- let me know what's left of that motion.

15:06:34 1 MR. BLUMENFELD: I'm not sure, Your Honor, that  
15:06:37 2 there is anything left that we need to deal with today. We  
15:06:40 3 may well get into the issue of them putting Mr. Williamson,  
15:06:44 4 Mr. Abby, Mr. Haas, their witnesses on to talk about -- to  
15:06:49 5 create an impression that there is a parade of horribles  
15:06:53 6 that are going to happen and if that does --

15:06:54 7 THE COURT: I understand. I understand. And  
15:06:56 8 I'm not in any way precluding you from objecting to that, or  
15:07:01 9 from raising that before the witnesses get on the stand and  
15:07:04 10 asking for a proffer on what they're going to say on that so  
15:07:08 11 we can address it.

15:07:09 12 MR. BLUMENFELD: Thank you.

15:07:09 13 If I can respond to the colloquy that you had on  
15:07:12 14 damages, this is kind of an interesting issue for us. Back  
15:07:15 15 when we were before you in March, you asked them whether  
15:07:18 16 they were asserting a damages claim and they said no. They  
15:07:23 17 left themselves open to possibly doing it later. They've  
15:07:26 18 never given us a damages expert report. They've never given  
15:07:29 19 us a disclosure of a damages theory. They haven't put --

15:07:33 20 THE COURT: How scary it must be that they want  
15:07:37 21 me to figure it out.

15:07:39 22 MR. BLUMENFELD: But if you go to the pretrial  
15:07:41 23 order, I don't know if you have it in front of you.

15:07:44 24 THE COURT: I can pull it up. Give me a second.

15:07:49 25 MR. BLUMENFELD: It's Exhibit 13 to the pretrial

15:07:51 1 order. It's in the pretrial order in a number of places.

15:08:02 2 THE COURT: Okay.

15:08:03 3 MR. BLUMENFELD: Starting at the bottom of

15:08:05 4 page 16, paragraph 120(b).

15:08:07 5 THE COURT: Hold on, my exhibit -- I don't know  
15:08:11 6 what this is.

15:08:15 7 MR. BLUMENFELD: It's Exhibit 13 which is  
15:08:17 8 plaintiff's statement of intended proof.

15:08:31 9 THE COURT: Okay. What paragraph?

15:08:33 10 MR. BLUMENFELD: At the very bottom of the page  
15:08:34 11 they list the relief they're seeking. And paragraph B says

15:08:39 12 --

15:08:39 13 THE COURT: I'm sorry, which page?

15:08:41 14 MR. BLUMENFELD: Page 16. Sorry, Your Honor.

15:08:44 15 Says an order requiring defendants to pay royalties, an  
15:08:50 16 accounting pre and post-trial judgment interest,  
15:08:53 17 supplemental damages, incidental damages and/or attorney's  
15:08:58 18 fees and costs and other monetary compensation as an  
15:09:02 19 equitable remedy. And they have never disclosed this.

15:09:06 20 Their position they've always taken is it can't be  
15:09:09 21 calculated. Now they're saying oh, we're going to seek  
15:09:13 22 damages, including I don't know what other monetary  
15:09:16 23 compensation means. If you look up damages in the legal  
15:09:20 24 dictionary, it probably says monetary compensation. If they  
15:09:24 25 were going to put forth some kind of a damages theory, now I

15:09:29 1 don't think they have a right to do it later, we may end up  
15:09:33 2 briefing that, but we're going to have a trial  
15:09:36 3 December 16th, I would have thought that was the time to do  
15:09:38 4 it and they didn't do it. I don't think they get to come in  
15:09:41 5 and say oh, if we win, then we'll put in the evidence that  
15:09:46 6 we didn't give you before the jury trial. I wanted to bring  
15:09:50 7 that to your attention, they're not going to try to put in a  
15:09:53 8 damages case on December 16th --

15:09:55 9 THE COURT: No. And presumably when I look at  
15:09:58 10 any equitable relief that's requested I can either see what  
15:10:03 11 they're asking you to do and come up with a number, notwithstanding  
15:10:07 12 that they told me monetary damages are not --  
15:10:11 13 or I can say that it's been waived or some other equitable  
15:10:16 14 reason I don't have to do that at their request because of  
15:10:19 15 the positions that they have taken in this case.

15:10:23 16 But those are all issues that I don't think  
15:10:25 17 we're going to address today.

15:10:27 18 MR. BLUMENFELD: And we will undoubtedly be  
15:10:29 19 taking the position that they can't raise that.

15:10:34 20 THE COURT: Okay.

15:10:35 21 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, on the list of things  
15:10:38 22 that can't be addressed today, but based on the  
15:10:42 23 representation of the plaintiffs of what they will not be  
15:10:46 24 arguing with respect to harm and their acknowledgment that  
15:10:50 25 harm is an element, I don't know that just alleging a

15:10:54 1 breach, which is basically what they're saying they're going  
15:10:58 2 to do and having that suffice to harm is legally sufficient.

15:11:02 3 THE COURT: Well, I think that there is enough  
15:11:05 4 here to allow me to let them go to a jury and assert that  
15:11:09 5 they have suffered harm. So you're not getting summary  
15:11:14 6 judgment today. I understand what you're saying, but I  
15:11:17 7 think in terms of saying things like reputational harm or  
15:11:22 8 whatever, that there is enough that they can go to a jury.  
15:11:25 9 So that's where I am on that.

15:11:27 10 MS. DUNN: Okay. I just want to make sure I put  
15:11:29 11 the argument on the record because I don't know that under  
15:11:32 12 the case law that that is true.

15:11:35 13 THE COURT: Then appeal my denial of the summary  
15:11:38 14 judgment that you just made right here.

15:11:41 15 Okay. Now, other issues in the pretrial order.  
15:11:48 16 I think that's all the motions in limine and Daubert --  
15:11:51 17 Daubert's I haven't given you my order yet, the one I had a  
15:11:56 18 question on.

15:11:56 19 Okay. So then other issues. The pending  
15:12:10 20 motions, I don't think there are any pending motions here  
15:12:14 21 except for the Daubert's, which I'll get you out soon.  
15:12:20 22 Summary judgment I have resolved. I'm denying it to the  
15:12:24 23 extent that you don't think I already have. And there was a  
15:12:30 24 motion to compel or something, and I'm not granting that  
15:12:37 25 either.

15:12:37 1                   Okay. Paragraph 11, settlement efforts. I know  
15:12:44 2 that I ordered you all to engage in discussions. I know  
15:12:50 3 it's not time yet for you to get back to me, but where are  
15:12:54 4 we?

15:12:56 5                   MR. OLSON: Your Honor, the CEOs of ARM and  
15:13:00 6 Qualcomm met on November 14th for as I understand it about  
15:13:07 7 two hours with the general counsels as well. Following that  
15:13:13 8 executives are having discussions this week and we will be  
15:13:17 9 more than happy to provide a follow-up on November 27th as  
15:13:23 10 previously ordered. I don't have more either as to  
15:13:27 11 substance or otherwise that I can say.

15:13:29 12                   THE COURT: That's okay. I don't need the  
15:13:31 13 substance. Where did they meet?

15:13:34 14                   MR. OLSON: They met in Palo Alto, actually in  
15:13:39 15 Morrison Foerster's office, by agreement of the parties, the  
15:13:42 16 outside counsel were not present.

15:13:43 17                   THE COURT: Okay. Anything that the defendants  
15:13:46 18 need to add to that?

15:13:47 19                   MS. DUNN: No, Your Honor.

15:13:48 20                   THE COURT: All right. I expect those to  
15:13:50 21 continue.

15:13:51 22                   All right. Paragraph 13, plaintiff's issues of  
15:13:59 23 fact on whether defendants have been unjustly enriched and  
15:14:05 24 ARM is entitled to royalties or disgorgement.

15:14:20 25                   MS. DURIE: I apologize, Your Honor. Your Honor

15:14:22 1 is on --

15:14:23 2 THE COURT: Paragraph 13 is plaintiff's issues  
15:14:26 3 of fact. When we looked through those in Exhibit 2, we had  
15:14:31 4 questions about the assertion of unjust enrichment, which I  
15:14:37 5 don't recall ever hearing about before, or disgorgement.

15:14:43 6 MS. DURIE: I think the short answer is that  
15:14:46 7 those would be issues, equitable issues for the --

15:14:52 8 THE COURT: When did you think we were going to  
15:14:54 9 deal with these equitable issues?

15:14:57 10 MS. DURIE: I think, Your Honor, that the  
15:14:59 11 parties at least are in agreement that it would make sense  
15:15:04 12 following the jury verdict to set a further date to appear  
15:15:08 13 in front of Your Honor and present any additional evidence  
15:15:13 14 that bore on the remedies question.

15:15:35 15 THE COURT: Okay.

15:15:40 16 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, our position would be as  
15:15:42 17 Mr. Blumenfeld said, these desired remedies were not pled.

15:15:58 18 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what I'm  
15:16:00 19 supposed to do. I have no idea if they were pled. Nobody  
15:16:06 20 -- what am I supposed to do here? When is it that you all  
15:16:11 21 think I'm going to deal with this? Like you're just going  
15:16:15 22 to what -- first of all, if we need to deal with the  
15:16:19 23 equitable issues, I typically deal with equitable issues in  
15:16:23 24 the evenings while the jury is out during the time that  
15:16:25 25 we're having a trial. So you need to figure out how that

15:16:30 1 would work in this case. And then if there is something  
15:16:39 2 where you say well, we need the jury verdict in order to do  
15:16:42 3 it, then how much time do you think you're going to need?  
15:16:51 4 Because we ought to schedule it right now. We can do it  
15:16:55 5 right now. So normally I would say we'll hear any equitable  
15:17:00 6 issues in the evening after the jury leaves. How's that  
15:17:08 7 work?

15:17:09 8 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, I think what the parties  
15:17:12 9 had discussed, which I don't know if this is what the Court  
15:17:18 10 is talking about, when it talks about equitable issues, that  
15:17:22 11 if there is a jury verdict, there would be a remedies phase  
15:17:25 12 to discuss specific performance.

15:17:27 13 THE COURT: Yes. But assume that there might be  
15:17:31 14 other equitable issues, like I find based on the letters  
15:17:34 15 that you're going to submit that unclean hands doesn't go to  
15:17:38 16 the jury, it comes to me, that I allow for some of these  
15:17:42 17 other disgorgement, whatever, I don't know, can we then do  
15:17:51 18 those issues -- if the only issue is specific performance  
15:17:54 19 that requires the jury, any other issues that I determine to  
15:17:58 20 be equitable based on these letters, can we do those in the  
15:18:02 21 evenings after the jury leaves?

15:18:04 22 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, I think -- I have no  
15:18:07 23 objection to that, but I think part of what's going on here,  
15:18:11 24 and the parties I'm sure are at fault for this, is there are  
15:18:15 25 things in these filings that -- where there is not agreement

15:18:19 1 that there should be on a decision on them at all because  
15:18:23 2 they weren't pled so that is an issue --

15:18:25 3 THE COURT: When did you think you were going to  
15:18:28 4 raise that with me? Truly, I'm like lost, you keep raising  
15:18:33 5 new stuff to me, so when did you think you were going to  
15:18:37 6 deal with this?

15:18:38 7 MS. DUNN: Your Honor --

15:18:39 8 THE COURT: You're just going to wait until  
15:18:42 9 what, I set a hearing in April and then you could brief some  
15:18:45 10 more? No.

15:18:46 11 MS. DUNN: I understand.

15:18:46 12 THE COURT: No. You guys can't do this  
15:18:49 13 piecemeal stuff. Okay? So what's your plan because this  
15:18:54 14 all has to be done. You will have -- for equitable relief,  
15:19:01 15 you have -- your options are the day after -- the evenings  
15:19:05 16 after whatever, and then I have time on Thursday,  
15:19:11 17 January 2nd, all day, and if necessary in the afternoon of  
15:19:16 18 the 3rd. So those are our times when we can do these  
15:19:21 19 things. Those are our times. Tell me what your proposal is  
15:19:25 20 to figure out what we're deciding in those times.

15:19:29 21 MS. DUNN: Well, Your Honor, my proposal having  
15:19:31 22 not consulted with the client on availability, but I'm not  
15:19:35 23 going to make it anyway is to accept Your Honor's  
15:19:38 24 January 2nd and 3rd time because that will also allow for us  
15:19:43 25 to have a discussion with the other side about what should

15:19:47 1 not -- and potentially brief the Court on what does not have  
15:19:51 2 to be decided at all because it was put into the PTO within  
15:19:55 3 the last week.

15:19:56 4 THE COURT: So just so you know, I let my  
15:20:00 5 chambers have off from the 23rd until the 1st. So when I  
15:20:10 6 say I let them have off, I'm not making them deal with our  
15:20:14 7 motions.

15:20:15 8 MS. DUNN: Understood.

15:20:16 9 THE COURT: So I need a motion, I need you to  
15:20:18 10 tell me when --

15:20:19 11 MS. DUNN: We can confirm this by next week. I  
15:20:23 12 think the question is -- you know, I want to give the Court  
15:20:28 13 whatever room the Court wants. Nobody expects anybody here  
15:20:31 14 to work between the 23rd and the 1st certainly, but I do  
15:20:34 15 think we would like to brief the issues of what have been  
15:20:37 16 put in here as sort of a last minute that were not pled that  
15:20:40 17 have not been litigated so the Court does not have to decide  
15:20:44 18 those issues at night during a trial, our proposal --

15:20:47 19 THE COURT: This is what I am going to do. You  
15:20:50 20 can Friday, you can have three pages to tell me what issues  
15:20:56 21 you think -- actually, let's just start with this so I don't  
15:21:01 22 have to wait until Friday. What issues do you think are  
15:21:04 23 going to the jury?

15:21:08 24 Plaintiff?

15:21:09 25 MS. DURIE: ARM's claim for breach of the NuVia

15:21:17 1 ALA by NuVia and Qualcomm. And NuVia and Qualcomm's  
15:21:27 2 defenses to that breach.

15:21:29 3 THE COURT: Okay. Don't get to defenses. Your  
15:21:33 4 only claim is breach?

15:21:34 5 MS. DURIE: Correct.

15:21:35 6 THE COURT: You say NuVia breached by not  
15:21:38 7 getting your approval when it did the triangular merger,  
15:21:43 8 right?

15:21:44 9 MS. DURIE: Yes.

15:21:44 10 THE COURT: And that somehow you were damaged  
15:21:49 11 and then Qualcomm breached by using that technology in an  
15:21:54 12 unlicensed manner and I guess it was -- somebody said it was  
15:21:57 13 supposed to be destroyed.

15:21:59 14 MS. DURIE: Both NuVia and Qualcomm breached in  
15:22:02 15 our view by closing the transaction.

15:22:05 16 THE COURT: Okay.

15:22:05 17 MS. DURIE: And continuing to use ARM  
15:22:08 18 confidential --

15:22:08 19 THE COURT: Okay. That's your claim. What  
15:22:10 20 defenses, whether I agree or not, but tell me what defenses  
15:22:16 21 you believe should be going to the jury even though  
15:22:19 22 understand I may say some of them are equitable.

15:22:23 23 MS. DUNN: First of all, the 16.3 breach was not  
15:22:26 24 pled, and is also -- there is no remedy for it that the  
15:22:33 25 plaintiffs have sought so our view what is going to the jury

15:22:38 1 is the breach of 15.1 which is the termination provision,  
15:22:44 2 that is as to both NuVia and Qualcomm.

15:22:48 3 And then with respect to our defenses, we  
15:22:53 4 believe that it is going to the jury whether we proved that  
15:22:59 5 our CPUs are licensed under Qualcomm's ALA and whether we  
15:23:05 6 proved that ARM's statements that the Qualcomm ALA expires  
15:23:09 7 in 2025 are false. And those were our DJ claims.

15:23:16 8 But this is one reason I thought the Court might  
15:23:19 9 like briefing is that there is some -- the idea that the  
15:23:23 10 16.3 is now a breach claim with a remedy that was pled is  
15:23:29 11 not true.

15:23:30 12 THE COURT: Yes. But where does unclean hands  
15:23:32 13 fall into this? You're just telling me what you think are  
15:23:35 14 issues. I don't know what the claims are. Like they have a  
15:23:38 15 breach of contract claim, you have a we didn't breach  
15:23:43 16 defense. I don't know what these other things are. You  
15:23:45 17 have a license defense. Is that a license defense to a  
15:23:48 18 breach of contract that you didn't breach? I don't know.

15:23:53 19 MS. DUNN: Yeah, Your Honor, is the answer. And  
15:23:56 20 I mean, on our verdict form we have the 15.1 breach between  
15:24:02 21 -- as to Qualcomm and as to NuVia, both companies. We have  
15:24:05 22 a question that gets to unclean hands, which is whether we  
15:24:11 23 have proven that ARM acted towards Qualcomm in such a way  
15:24:15 24 that ARM -- that the relief it seeks should be denied, the  
15:24:19 25 relief that it seeks. We have a question --

15:24:22 1 THE COURT: Hold on. Originally you said 15.1,  
15:24:26 2 CPUs licensed under the Qualcomm and ARM's statements are  
15:24:30 3 **false**.

15:24:30 4 MS. DUNN: I apologize.

15:24:32 5 THE COURT: I don't know, now you're talking  
15:24:34 6 about unclean hands based on facts that I don't know what  
15:24:38 7 the basis for those are. These are the basis of unclean  
15:24:41 8 hands or unclean hands is somehow different and I find it  
15:24:44 9 really kind of frustrating that we're at a pretrial  
15:24:48 10 conference and you guys haven't talked about what's in this  
15:24:51 11 case. And to the extent that they raised issues that are in  
15:24:54 12 the pretrial order that you said they didn't raise, I don't  
15:24:57 13 know what you were keeping it a secret for.

15:24:59 14 MS. DUNN: I understand, Your Honor.

15:25:01 15 THE COURT: I still -- I'm lost. 15.1.

15:25:03 16 MS. DUNN: So with respect to the defenses that  
15:25:08 17 we believe go to the jury, unclean hands.

15:25:13 18 THE COURT: Based on?

15:25:14 19 MS. DUNN: Factually based on or based on?

15:25:17 20 THE COURT: What is the basis of your unclean  
15:25:19 21 hands defense? What did they do?

15:25:22 22 MS. DUNN: First of all, they waited a year to  
15:25:28 23 terminate. During that year they used the threat of  
15:25:32 24 termination to try to negotiate up their royalty rates.  
15:25:38 25 They interfered with our customers. They told Samsung that

15:25:41 1 our license would expire. They -- I won't go into all the  
15:25:49 2 internal documents that we have from ARM, but it's clear  
15:25:54 3 what was going on, that they slow rolled the negotiations on  
15:25:58 4 purpose. So there is a whole host of unclean hands facts  
15:26:05 5 that support this defense.

15:26:07 6 Some of those facts similarly support the waiver  
15:26:10 7 defense because ARM acted as if -- I should say as an  
15:26:19 8 antecedent matter. Qualcomm even before the merger closed  
15:26:22 9 or the acquisition closed alerted ARM that it would be  
15:26:27 10 preceding under the Qualcomm ALA with the NuVia employees,  
15:26:32 11 it was very clear, and that was a year before the contract  
15:26:35 12 was terminated.

15:26:36 13 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Fine, unclean hands  
15:26:39 14 based on whatever you just said. Waiver based on the fact  
15:26:42 15 that they waited a year. What else do you think is going to  
15:26:45 16 the jury?

15:26:46 17 MS. DUNN: And then that we are licensed under  
15:26:50 18 our license agreement. And then our declaratory judgment  
15:26:57 19 request about ARM's statements to our license -- to our  
15:27:01 20 customer that our license would expire is false.

15:27:06 21 THE COURT: That's it?

15:27:07 22 MS. DUNN: I believe that's it, unless somebody  
15:27:09 23 here tells me I'm forgetting something. I'm sorry, ARM's  
15:27:14 24 failure to perform under the NuVia ALA, which we would  
15:27:18 25 elicit evidence of that as a defense. Obviously we're not

15:27:23 1 bringing that as a separate claim.

15:27:28 2 THE COURT: Okay. So you are then on Friday  
15:27:34 3 going to submit to me three pages that tell me why unclean  
15:27:39 4 hands and waiver and anything else that may be equitable is  
15:27:42 5 not equitable. And you can have until the end of the day  
15:27:48 6 Monday to respond, plaintiff. And then what other equitable  
15:28:00 7 issues would there be based on any possible decision by the  
15:28:06 8 jury?

15:28:08 9 MS. DURIE: I think the additional issues are  
15:28:11 10 all remedies issues. We do believe that we have pled a  
15:28:18 11 request both for specific performance and for various other  
15:28:22 12 categories of relief incidental to that request. But all of  
15:28:26 13 those would be remedies issues for the Court.

15:28:29 14 THE COURT: Okay. So then what we're going to  
15:28:32 15 do is you guys need to talk and you need to identify to them  
15:28:37 16 what you think has not been properly pleaded and then when  
15:28:42 17 they tell you what those things are, you can send me three  
15:28:45 18 pages that say no, here they're pleaded.

15:28:50 19 MS. DURIE: Right.

15:28:51 20 THE COURT: Okay. And then you can respond by  
15:28:53 21 the end of the day Monday to that.

15:28:54 22 MS. DUNN: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you.

15:28:57 23 THE COURT: And I am toying with the idea  
15:29:01 24 depending on whether this is -- many of these issues are, in  
15:29:08 25 fact, equitable that we may just have a four-day jury trial

15:29:12 1 and one of those days will be equitable issues. But it may  
15:29:17 2 also be that I deal with the other equitable issues during  
15:29:23 3 the trial and then we can deal with any specific performance  
15:29:28 4 issues on the 2nd. But I need to figure that out once I see  
15:29:34 5 your submissions.

15:29:39 6 Okay. Exhibits. There was something that I saw  
15:29:51 7 that suggested somebody wanted to submit an edited exhibit  
15:29:59 8 list or something.

15:30:03 9 MS. YING: Your Honor, the parties have  
15:30:05 10 continued to confer since the filing of the PTO on the 13th  
15:30:08 11 and I believe both sides have updates to their exhibit lists  
15:30:13 12 as well as their deposition designations that they have  
15:30:16 13 exchanged with each other so we would just need to get those  
15:30:19 14 into the version of the PTO that Your Honor has, whether we  
15:30:24 15 do that via a revised --

15:30:28 16 THE COURT: Why weren't they included? I mean,  
15:30:30 17 it's a pretrial order. I don't usually allow for -- I mean,  
15:30:35 18 why -- it's kind of a waste of my time to have to deal with  
15:30:39 19 a pretrial order and then we have like other little bits of  
15:30:43 20 it in a different portion of the record. So why weren't --  
15:30:48 21 why wasn't this done before?

15:30:50 22 MS. YING: I think, Your Honor, to be frank I  
15:30:52 23 think the parties have continued to confer on outstanding  
15:30:56 24 issues.

15:30:56 25 THE COURT: But conferring suggests that you

15:30:58 1 would lessen the exhibits and the deposition designations.

15:31:01 2 I'm getting the feeling that you're adding.

15:31:04 3 MS. YING: I believe there may have been  
15:31:07 4 additions as well as deletions. I can't speak to both of  
15:31:10 5 them.

15:31:10 6 THE COURT: Why do I let that happen?

15:31:13 7 MS. YING: I think, Your Honor, we've made these  
15:31:16 8 edits in good faith and have been agreed upon, so I think,  
15:31:20 9 you know, the parties would like to submit that universe to  
15:31:25 10 Your Honor if Your Honor would allow us to do so. And I'll  
15:31:30 11 let anyone from ARM speak as well, I think Mr. --

15:31:34 12 THE COURT: I don't understand. It's not  
15:31:36 13 supposed to be a piecemeal thing. What are you doing? Why  
15:31:40 14 wasn't it in there first? What's the big pause?

15:31:45 15 MR. HUTTINGER: I think in large part the  
15:31:46 16 changes to the exhibit list are things like fixing,  
15:31:50 17 correcting end Bates numbers and are not terribly  
15:31:54 18 substantial.

15:31:55 19 THE COURT: You don't really need to do it, do  
15:31:56 20 you, if you all agree? What's the big deal?

15:32:00 21 MR. HUTTINGER: There are a handful of  
15:32:01 22 supplemental exhibits.

15:32:02 23 THE COURT: Why weren't they included?

15:32:04 24 MS. YING: I think what happened to be frank, I  
15:32:06 25 think the parties were looking at -- for example, I know

15:32:09 1 there are some things, some of the expert reports they were  
15:32:11 2 trying to figure out if they had the correct date ranges and  
15:32:15 3 we may or may not have realized paper copies of things were  
15:32:18 4 sent. There were continuing discussion about these that we  
15:32:22 5 flagged to basically sort out after the 13th whether the PTO  
15:32:26 6 was due and it was not intended to --

15:32:29 7 THE COURT: No, the problem I have is then when  
15:32:31 8 I have to look at a pretrial order and there is an issue, I  
15:32:35 9 have to go find other portions, that's why I expect people  
15:32:39 10 to do what they need to do and give me a pretrial order that  
15:32:42 11 is the universe of what they intend to include. And I don't  
15:32:49 12 want a -- if you're going to say give me another 900 page  
15:32:53 13 pretrial order if that was going to be the suggestion.

15:32:55 14 MS. DURIE: I was going to suggest that we  
15:32:58 15 submit an amended pretrial order that replaced this with the  
15:33:03 16 additional exhibits.

15:33:06 17 THE COURT: Yeah, that's an additional 900 page  
15:33:09 18 document which I could live without. Thanks. So I am not  
15:33:13 19 hearing that this is anything that's terribly important, so  
15:33:18 20 is it important? And if so, tell me what these things are  
15:33:22 21 that are so important now that you need them but they  
15:33:25 22 weren't so important that you cared enough to put them in  
15:33:28 23 originally.

15:33:30 24 MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, I want to say with  
15:33:32 25 respect to the deposition designations, the additions there

15:33:35 1 have to do with the fact that the parties conferred after  
15:33:38 2 the filing of the pretrial order in an effort to whittle  
15:33:43 3 down the witness list and some of the will calls moved off,  
15:33:47 4 some of the may calls moved off necessitating some of the  
15:33:50 5 additional designations for people that perhaps are no  
15:33:53 6 longer coming to trial. And there was a paragraph in the  
15:33:56 7 pretrial order that I think is in dispute that relates to  
15:33:59 8 this as well in terms of this, so it would be important for  
15:34:02 9 us to update those designations, but it's an effort by the  
15:34:06 10 parties to streamline who is really being called live.

15:34:11 11 THE COURT: That's what I needed. Thank you.

15:34:12 12 You may do that.

15:34:13 13 MS. NYARADY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15:34:14 14 THE COURT: You may do that. But I don't want a  
15:34:17 15 whole new pretrial order and what you need to do is you need  
15:34:21 16 to work with Ms. Welham to have those things added to or  
15:34:26 17 swapped out in the pretrial order because I don't want parts  
15:34:30 18 of it in all different places.

15:34:32 19 MS. NYARADY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15:34:33 20 Understood.

15:34:33 21 THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 39. Documents.  
15:35:10 22 Defendant, can you help me understand what the point of your  
15:35:12 23 proposal was. I don't know that I care, but I don't really  
15:35:17 24 understand what the point is.

15:35:19 25 MS. NYARADY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. So

15:35:21 1 this, I think as a practical matter it probably has no  
15:35:25 2 impact, but we did not want to have a stipulation in the  
15:35:29 3 pretrial order that said that documents that were produced  
15:35:33 4 by a party are deemed to be business records of that party  
15:35:36 5 because we produced all of the documents with a Qualcomm  
15:35:41 6 Bates number. Some of the documents are NuVia business  
15:35:44 7 records, some of them are Qualcomm business records, so we  
15:35:48 8 were trying -- and I appreciate that maybe the language  
15:35:52 9 didn't serve its purpose if it's not understandable, but I  
15:35:55 10 was trying to get across that it is a business record for  
15:35:58 11 the party that created the document. So the requirements of  
15:36:03 12 being created in the regular course of business activity and  
15:36:06 13 that they were kept by the business, we wanted to make it  
15:36:10 14 clear that the NuVia documents are not Qualcomm business  
15:36:14 15 records and vice versa. I think where this really comes up  
15:36:17 16 is more in a 602 issue depending on which witness they try  
15:36:21 17 to use it with which document was created. I don't think it  
15:36:25 18 impacts how the trial is going to go, but I just wanted to  
15:36:29 19 be clear on the record that we can't enter into a  
15:36:31 20 stipulation that every document produced with a Qualcomm  
15:36:35 21 Bates number in the litigation as Qualcomm business record.

15:36:39 22 THE COURT: It could have come in NuVia.

15:36:42 23 MS. NYARADY: Correct.

15:36:43 24 THE COURT: What's the problem with that?

15:36:44 25 MS. DURIE: My concern is we didn't understand

15:36:46 1 what the practical important of this was. Qualcomm produced  
15:36:50 2 all of these documents so they were all maintained by  
15:36:52 3 Qualcomm. We do understand that some of them were created  
15:36:55 4 at NuVia. It wasn't clear to us what distinction the  
15:36:58 5 defendants were trying to draw or for what purpose.

15:37:01 6 THE COURT: Did you ask?

15:37:03 7 MS. DURIE: I did not personally participate in  
15:37:06 8 the meet and confer.

15:37:08 9 THE COURT: I mean, that's silly. Right? You  
15:37:15 10 submit this to me, we had to spend our time looking at this,  
15:37:17 11 we had to spend our time trying to figure out what this  
15:37:21 12 meant and you don't even know, you don't even bother to talk  
15:37:24 13 to each other. That's just kind of -- that's not very  
15:37:28 14 respectful of anyone's time but your own.

15:37:31 15 MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, we did discuss this at  
15:37:33 16 the meet and confer. I was on the meet and confer. I want  
15:37:37 17 to say what I told you, I told ARM, I want to make that  
15:37:40 18 clear. We are not trying to disrespect the Court's time. I  
15:37:43 19 made it clear that I thought there was no practical impact  
15:37:46 20 to the trial. We were preserving because we had different  
15:37:49 21 parties and different business records.

15:37:50 22 THE COURT: All right. Defendants' proposals  
15:37:54 23 are accepted.

15:38:05 24 Paragraph 48 on demonstratives.

15:38:11 25 MS. DURIE: We have resolved that one, Your

15:38:13 1 Honor.

15:38:13 2 THE COURT: There is no dispute?

15:38:15 3 MS. DURIE: Correct.

15:38:15 4 THE COURT: You say absent agreement

15:38:17 5 demonstratives are illustrative. I'm saying they're not  
15:38:21 6 evidence even if you agree to it.

15:38:23 7 MS. DURIE: Understood.

15:38:25 8 THE COURT: Paragraph 51 and 52 on witness  
15:38:32 9 lists. Is there an issue on this one?

15:38:41 10 MR. FUNG: Yes, Your Honor. Nicholas Fung on  
15:38:46 11 behalf of plaintiff, ARM. The first issue, we object to  
15:38:49 12 Qualcomm's identification of a witness named Nick Jones.  
15:38:53 13 Nick Jones was never included on any of Qualcomm's initial  
15:38:56 14 disclosures. We found out for the first time a few weeks  
15:38:59 15 ago that Qualcomm intended to call him at trial when they  
15:39:02 16 added him to their initial witness list. We spoke to  
15:39:04 17 Qualcomm about this and they pointed us to an interrogatory  
15:39:08 18 response, a supplemental interrogatory response where  
15:39:11 19 Mr. Jones was listed along with seven other witnesses as  
15:39:14 20 having knowledge in response to that interrogatory. That's  
15:39:16 21 not sufficient at all to provide us notice that they were  
15:39:19 22 calling Mr. Jones at trial.

15:39:21 23 There is case law supporting the proposition  
15:39:23 24 that simply mentioning a witness in a rog response does not  
15:39:27 25 provide notice that that witness be called at trial. We

15:39:31 1 believe Mr. Jones should be precluded from testifying. So  
15:39:34 2 that's one of the issues.

15:39:35 3 The other issue is Qualcomm has objected to ten  
15:39:39 4 of our witnesses, or may call witnesses because they were  
15:39:42 5 never deposed. And we narrowed this dispute quite a bit on  
15:39:47 6 Monday. We've agreed not to call four of those ten  
15:39:50 7 witnesses and today we can agree not to call five of the  
15:39:54 8 remaining six of the witnesses. We would like to reserve  
15:39:57 9 our ability to call Mr. Jeff Defilippi. Mr. Defilippi was  
15:40:05 10 disclosed on our initial disclosures. Qualcomm did have a  
15:40:08 11 chance to depose him during fact discovery, they chose not  
15:40:12 12 to, and they still oppose Mr. Defilippi. They requested a  
15:40:17 13 deposition of him. We don't think they're entitled to it.

15:40:21 14 THE COURT: When did they ask for a deposition  
15:40:23 15 of him?

15:40:24 16 MR. FUNG: During the pretrial order.

15:40:25 17 THE COURT: But never did before?

15:40:27 18 MR. FUNG: No Your Honor.

15:40:28 19 THE COURT: It was in your Rule 26 disclosures?

15:40:30 20 MR. FUNG: Yes, the third amended Rule 26  
15:40:32 21 disclosers. With that being said to moot this dispute, if  
15:40:35 22 Qualcomm would agree not to call Mr. Jones, we will agree  
15:40:39 23 not to call Mr. Defilippi, but if they intend to present  
15:40:44 24 Mr. Jones, we don't think they're allowed, we would want to  
15:40:49 25 call Mr. Defilippi.

15:40:51 1                   **Thank you.**

15:40:51 2                   **THE COURT: Okay.**

15:40:52 3                   **MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, with respect to Nick**  
15:40:57 4 **Jones, he was not only identified in an interrogatory**  
15:41:01 5 **response, but he was also identified at the deposition of**  
15:41:08 6 **Ms. Voss back in November of 2023. And under the law, we**  
15:41:14 7 **think that is sufficient. The rules specifically says that**  
15:41:18 8 **you have a duty to supplement if the person is not otherwise**  
15:41:22 9 **identified through discovery. And, in fact, when you go to**  
15:41:26 10 **the committee notes it specifically says that there is no**  
15:41:30 11 **obligation to supplement, for example, when a witness is**  
15:41:36 12 **disclosed during the taking of a deposition. But we**  
15:41:40 13 **understand he was not on the initial disclosures. We think**  
15:41:43 14 **he was disclosed as being involved. He was identified at**  
15:41:46 15 **the deposition and in the rog response for the same subject**  
15:41:49 16 **matter.**

15:41:49 17                   **THE COURT: And the interrogatory response, that**  
15:41:52 18 **wasn't like on the last day of fact discovery or anything?**

15:41:55 19                   **MS. NYARADY: No, it was not. There were still**  
15:41:57 20 **depositions taking place a month after that. And so, you**  
15:42:01 21 **know, we think that he ought to be allowed to testify at**  
15:42:04 22 **trial.**

15:42:07 23                   **THE COURT: Okay. So if he should be allowed to**  
15:42:10 24 **testify at trial, why can't Mr. Defilippi --**

15:42:15 25                   **MS. NYARADY: So --**

15:42:16 1 THE COURT: -- who actually was disclosed in  
15:42:19 2 Rule 26 disclosures.

15:42:20 3 MS. NYARADY: He was disclosed in the Rule 26  
15:42:22 4 disclosures for the limited purpose of the counterclaim that  
15:42:25 5 we have dropped. It was in April of 2024. And we were not  
15:42:29 6 able to take his deposition because by virtue of being  
15:42:32 7 allowed to add that counterclaim we said we would only take  
15:42:36 8 one 30(b) (6) deposition which is what we did. They did not  
15:42:39 9 put him up for that. At the same time, Your Honor, to make  
15:42:43 10 life easy, I don't object to him being at trial if we could  
15:42:47 11 have a short trial deposition.

15:42:49 12 THE COURT: Would you agree to a deposition of  
15:42:50 13 Mr. Jones?

15:42:51 14 MS. NYARADY: We absolutely would, Your Honor.

15:42:53 15 THE COURT: How about that, I let you both  
15:42:55 16 depose them pretrial?

15:42:57 17 MR. FUNG: I mean, I want to make one  
15:42:59 18 clarification. Those interrogatory responses where  
15:43:02 19 Mr. Jones was disclosed, it was three weeks before the fact  
15:43:05 20 discovery, it was buried in the list of eight witnesses. I  
15:43:08 21 want to make --

15:43:09 22 THE COURT: Buried seems a little dramatic for  
15:43:12 23 eight.

15:43:13 24 MR. FUNG: Understood, Your Honor. Your  
15:43:15 25 proposal allowing us to take a deposition of Mr. Jones, that

15:43:18 1 will be acceptable to us.

15:43:20 2 THE COURT: Okay.

15:43:24 3 MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, in terms of the  
15:43:26 4 deposition, we would propose a couple of hours for each  
15:43:28 5 witness.

15:43:29 6 THE COURT: You can both figure that out.

15:43:31 7 MS. NYARADY: Okay.

15:43:32 8 THE COURT: Paragraph 56, you can't agree on who  
15:43:44 9 the corporate representative is, really?

15:43:51 10 MS. NYARADY: So Your Honor, subsequent to  
15:43:53 11 having filed a pretrial order, we did exchange names with  
15:43:57 12 respect to the corporate representatives. We have no  
15:44:01 13 objection. We haven't heard from ARM as to whether they  
15:44:05 14 have any objection, but I think perhaps this is resolved.

15:44:09 15 MS. DURIE: We do not. I don't know that there  
15:44:13 16 would be a basis for one, but we do not have one.

15:44:16 17 THE COURT: I am just going to strike -- I don't  
15:44:21 18 even know what I'm doing with this paragraph at this moment,  
15:44:24 19 but the parties may each have a corporate representative sit  
15:44:28 20 at the table. And experts are not excluded from the  
15:44:32 21 courtroom. And I don't care if there is agreement on who  
15:44:40 22 the corporate representatives are, but if you have one,  
15:44:44 23 that's terrific.

15:44:45 24 Okay. 68. The witness will be called only  
15:45:01 25 once. There are so many words here with the -- what is the

15:45:08 1 crux of the dispute?

15:45:09 2 MS. DURIE: Apologies. We have included on our  
15:45:12 3 witness list Gerard Williams, the former CEO of NuVia, now a  
15:45:18 4 senior vice-president at Qualcomm. We would intend to call  
15:45:21 5 him in our case-in-chief adverse as we believe the rules  
15:45:26 6 permit. Qualcomm has objected to that. And I do not  
15:45:32 7 understand the basis for that objection and I will assure  
15:45:35 8 the Court it is not for lack of asking, but we will let them  
15:45:39 9 speak for themselves.

15:45:42 10 MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, we had proposed a  
15:45:47 11 different course of action where the witnesses will be  
15:45:50 12 called only once, will be called by the sponsoring party and  
15:45:54 13 allowing the other side to go beyond the scope in cross.  
15:46:00 14 And we would propose leaving open ARM's case until  
15:46:03 15 Mr. Williams testifies and they finish cross-examining him  
15:46:08 16 so saving the JMOLs until after he testifies, we think it  
15:46:12 17 would be more orderly.

15:46:14 18 And as part of trying to resolve this, we also  
15:46:18 19 put in there that if this is adopted that the witness can be  
15:46:24 20 -- any live witness can be presented by deposition and the  
15:46:28 21 opposing party's presentation of their case.

15:46:31 22 THE COURT: I am going to allow NuVia -- ARM to  
15:46:34 23 call Mr. Williams in its case-in-chief and to the extent  
15:46:39 24 that defendant wants to ask whatever it wants to ask in the  
15:46:44 25 middle of that case-in-chief, defendants may.

15:46:48 1 MS. NYARADY: So if I understand, Your Honor, we  
15:46:50 2 can go beyond the scope for cross and put him on once, it  
15:46:54 3 will just be in ARM's case, is that what you're saying?

15:46:57 4 THE COURT: Yes.

15:46:58 5 MS. NYARADY: And with respect to the video, we  
15:47:00 6 would ask that if he's going to be called in their case that  
15:47:03 7 they not be allowed to play video and present him in their  
15:47:07 8 case.

15:47:09 9 THE COURT: That seems fair.

15:47:10 10 MS. DURIE: That's fine.

15:47:12 11 MS. NYARADY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15:47:13 12 THE COURT: Okay. We already talked about 78  
15:47:21 13 and 79, equitable stuff. The trial order, I don't know what  
15:47:43 14 the dispute is.

15:47:45 15 MS. DURIE: I think this turns entirely on  
15:47:47 16 whether the Court -- what the Court determines with respect  
15:47:50 17 to the counterclaims and whether they are equitable or legal  
15:47:55 18 and what gets tried to the jury. I don't think there is any  
15:47:59 19 other dispute other than that embedded in here.

15:48:01 20 THE COURT: Okay.

15:48:02 21 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, I agree with counsel on  
15:48:04 22 that. And we will brief this. I want to say, though,  
15:48:11 23 strongly that the law is that they are not equitable. So --

15:48:15 24 THE COURT: I don't care what you say, prove it.  
15:48:18 25 Show me in your papers. Okay?

15:48:19 1 MS. DUNN: We will do so.

15:48:20 2 THE COURT: You keep telling me that. It's not  
15:48:22 3 helpful. It just makes me annoyed, and I rather not be  
15:48:27 4 annoyed. You promised me you're going to show me, I'll read  
15:48:30 5 the case.

15:48:31 6 MS. DUNN: Sounds good.

15:48:32 7 THE COURT: You just saying I feel strongly  
15:48:34 8 about it is kind of counterproductive and it makes both of  
15:48:38 9 us feel bad right now. Why don't you sit down and you can  
15:48:41 10 submit your papers.

15:48:44 11 Length of trial. I am going to hold off on that  
15:48:49 12 until I make a determination as to what's going to go in  
15:48:54 13 front of the jury.

15:48:56 14 Jury selection. You all have agreed -- well, I  
15:49:03 15 don't remember. I have a bunch of trials coming up. Have  
15:49:08 16 you been asked if you'll agree to let a magistrate judge  
15:49:12 17 pick the jury on the 12th or the 13th?

15:49:15 18 MS. DURIE: Yes. And I believe we have agreed  
15:49:17 19 that we will.

15:49:19 20 MS. NYARADY: Yes, Your Honor.

15:49:20 21 THE COURT: Great. Sealing the courtroom.  
15:49:31 22 Generally if you want to seal the courtroom you have to meet  
15:49:38 23 the standard from the Third Circuit which is a very  
15:49:43 24 difficult standard to meet. It's basically strict scrutiny  
15:49:48 25 which means you probably lose. If you do think that you can

15:49:53 1 meet that and you want the courtroom closed for some reason,  
15:49:56 2 you must tell me in advance. If you don't tell me in  
15:50:01 3 advance, then I am definitely going to deny the request, and  
15:50:07 4 either you won't be able to seal the courtroom or you won't  
15:50:10 5 be able to if it's the other side's information use that in  
15:50:14 6 the way that you want.

15:50:15 7 Why is all this stuff under seal for thirty days  
15:50:29 8 after the conclusion of the trial? I mean, we're going to  
15:50:33 9 have exhibits that are shown up on the screen. What's my  
15:50:35 10 basis to say it's appropriate that those be sealed?

15:50:42 11 MS. DURIE: I believe, Your Honor, this is a  
15:50:44 12 reference to transcripts of sealed testimony and sealed  
15:50:47 13 exhibits. So it would provide time for the parties to  
15:50:53 14 undesignate portions of those for public consumption.

15:50:58 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for that  
15:50:59 16 clarification. That's okay.

15:51:00 17 The parties may access the courtroom to set up  
15:51:06 18 anything they want on Friday, December the 13th in the  
15:51:09 19 afternoon. Contact Mr. Buckson about that.

15:51:15 20 Paragraph 95. At the pretrial conference, this  
15:51:21 21 sounds ominous. At the pretrial conference defendants would  
15:51:24 22 like to discuss with the Court the process by which they may  
15:51:27 23 work around a counsel conflict.

15:51:31 24 MR. BLUMENFELD: Your Honor, we hope this won't  
15:51:34 25 even come up, but we have an issue with an agreement by Paul

15:51:44 1 Weiss lawyers not to get into issues involving Apple. I'm  
15:51:48 2 not sure that there will be any issues involving Apple that  
15:51:51 3 come up at trial, but if there is something that one of  
15:51:54 4 their witness says about Apple, we would like to have the  
15:51:58 5 opportunity to have Ms. Ying or I do the short part of that  
15:52:02 6 cross-examination. I don't think there is any opposition to  
15:52:05 7 that.

15:52:07 8 MS. DURIE: There is no objection to that.

15:52:10 9 THE COURT: That sounds find.

15:52:13 10 MR. BLUMENFELD: Thank you.

15:52:16 11 THE COURT: So I have jury selection will take  
15:52:25 12 place on the 16th, so apparently I'm just not familiar with  
15:52:39 13 what's been done, if that's the case, then with respect to  
15:52:41 14 the voir dire and the preliminary instructions, the voir  
15:52:50 15 dire, plaintiffs have to bring copies for the jurors. You  
15:52:53 16 have to get them 24 hours, by noon the day before we're  
15:52:57 17 going to select the jury which at this point would be the  
15:53:00 18 12th.

15:53:04 19 On or before noon on Friday, December 13th, the  
15:53:09 20 parties need to provide electronic versions of all trial  
15:53:13 21 exhibits to the exhibit list to us in a single folder. The  
15:53:17 22 best way to do that is to get them to us on a flash drive,  
15:53:20 23 but work with your IT departments and coordinate with  
15:53:25 24 Mr. Buckson so we can have all trial exhibits electronically  
15:53:28 25 on the first day of trial. The exhibits need to be named

15:53:30 1 with their exhibit numbers, JTX, PTX, just say JTX 1, PTX 2,  
15:53:40 2 so if I hit the files at top they'll come up in order.  
15:53:44 3 Additionally as previously mentioned -- it wasn't previously  
15:53:48 4 mentioned, but each morning the parties need to send an  
15:53:51 5 e-mail to Mr. Buckson and Ms. Welham each trial day the  
15:53:56 6 witness folders for each witness. The witness folders  
15:53:58 7 should contain the exhibits that would have otherwise gone  
15:54:00 8 into a witness binder organized by exhibit number. Also  
15:54:04 9 include any demonstratives to be used with that witness.

15:54:08 10 And direct exams that are happening, to the  
15:54:11 11 extent that there is going to be a cross binder that should  
15:54:15 12 also be provided to me by flash drive, and in that one, if  
15:54:19 13 you're going to use a deposition, include the deposition for  
15:54:23 14 me. You need to send the cross binders to me, but if you  
15:54:28 15 don't want to send the cross binders to the other side until  
15:54:31 16 the witness is called, that's fine. And that's just because  
15:54:34 17 we don't take paper copies of these things, so that way I  
15:54:38 18 have them all in one place to pull things up if there is a  
15:54:43 19 dispute.

15:54:45 20 Juror notebooks, if you guys agree on a set of  
15:54:48 21 documents that the jury should have in binders, that's fine,  
15:54:51 22 if you don't agree, then there are no jury binders.

15:54:54 23 You won't need to play the patent video, is that  
15:55:00 24 right?

15:55:00 25 MS. DURIE: I don't think so, Your Honor.

15:55:02 1                   THE COURT: That's just in here from a different  
15:55:07 2 case. That's good. I don't know why you would want to.

15:55:11 3                   Sorry.

15:55:14 4                   After trial, I need for you to review the trial  
15:55:18 5 transcript and submit any corrections to the court reporter  
15:55:21 6 no later than two weeks after trial. That way when we get  
15:55:24 7 to post-trial briefs we don't have to deal with errata.

15:55:29 8                   Juror lunches, have you guys talked about  
15:55:35 9 whether you want to provide lunches for the jury?

15:55:37 10                  MS. DURIE: Yes.

15:55:38 11                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you for that. And  
15:55:43 12 I think those were the issues that I had to discuss.

15:55:49 13                  Anything else?

15:55:51 14                  MS. DURIE: Not for the plaintiff, Your Honor.

15:55:55 15                  MS. NYARADY: Your Honor, there were a couple of  
15:55:57 16 disputes in the voir dire. I don't know if you want to take  
15:56:00 17 that up now.

15:56:01 18                  THE COURT: No. I'm just going to decide those.  
15:56:03 19 I don't need to hear anything more on those. I generally  
15:56:07 20 with respect to voir dire just do my normal. And maybe if I  
15:56:14 21 see something, but I did notice that the list of witnesses  
15:56:28 22 went on for about three pages. Are we really -- are all  
15:56:34 23 those people really need to be on there?

15:56:37 24                  MS. NYARADY: I would think not, especially in  
15:56:39 25 light of conversations that we had.

15:56:41 1 THE COURT: Why don't you guys provide me with  
15:56:43 2 an updated list that doesn't look quite so awful for jurors.

15:56:51 3 MS. NYARDY: We will also make a change just to  
15:56:53 4 take OUT the language that addresses the counterclaim that  
15:56:55 5 has been dropped.

15:56:57 6 And the other last question I had, Your Honor,  
15:56:59 7 was whether you want us -- we had listed every lawyer who  
15:57:04 8 has touched this case for each of the firms. Would you want  
15:57:08 9 us to do that, because that list is quite long as well, or  
15:57:11 10 do you only want lawyers who are going to appear before the  
15:57:15 11 jury?

15:57:17 12 THE COURT: So I would say only lawyers who  
15:57:21 13 appear before the jury, or -- but that includes if they're  
15:57:25 14 going to be in court even if they're not identified, or if  
15:57:30 15 they are somehow identified in a deposition. Sometimes it  
15:57:36 16 will say Ms. Smith, just so that -- you know, the point of  
15:57:40 17 that is just to make sure nobody knows them. I don't think  
15:57:44 18 it will be an issue. It will be anyone who appears in court  
15:57:48 19 whether they're speaking or not, and whether they're live or  
15:57:52 20 on video.

15:57:53 21 MS. NYARADY: Understood. Thank you, Your  
15:57:55 22 Honor.

15:57:56 23 THE COURT: Anything else?

15:58:00 24 MS. NYARADY: Not for the defendants.

15:58:01 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you everyone.

15:58:05 1 COURTRoom DEPUTY: All rise. Court is  
15:58:07 2 adjourned.

3 (Court adjourned at 3:58 p.m.)

4

5 I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and  
6 accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.

7 /s/ Dale C. Hawkins  
8 Official Court Reporter  
9 U.S. District Court

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

<b>\$</b> <b>\$100</b> [1] - 25:14 	<b>24</b> [1] - 73:16 <b>25</b> [1] - 15:8 <b>250</b> [2] - 13:16, 14:6 <b>26</b> [5] - 15:8, 65:19, 65:20, 67:2, 67:3 <b>27</b> [1] - 15:8 <b>27th</b> [1] - 48:9 <b>2:00</b> [1] - 1:13 <b>2nd</b> [3] - 51:17, 51:24, 58:4	<b>A</b> <b>Abby</b> [1] - 44:4 <b>ability</b> [6] - 17:9, 28:11, 28:15, 33:9, 38:13, 65:9 <b>able</b> [11] - 8:10, 27:3, 33:16, 34:3, 34:8, 41:20, 43:5, 43:7, 67:6, 72:4, 72:5 <b>absent</b> [1] - 64:4 <b>3</b> <b>3</b> [4] - 7:22, 9:5, 18:16, 23:24 <b>30(b)(6)</b> [1] - 67:8 <b>318</b> [1] - 14:12 <b>39</b> [1] - 61:21 <b>3:58</b> [1] - 77:3 <b>3rd</b> [2] - 51:18, 51:24	<b>adopt</b> [2] - 7:12, 7:15 <b>adopted</b> [1] - 69:19 <b>advance</b> [3] - 7:2, 72:2, 72:3 <b>adverse</b> [1] - 69:5 <b>affect</b> [4] - 38:12, 38:13, 38:14, 38:22 <b>affects</b> [2] - 28:10, 33:11 <b>affirmatively</b> [1] - 21:16 <b>afternoon</b> [9] - 3:2, 3:5, 3:11, 3:12, 3:13, 3:21, 24:15, 51:17, 72:19 <b>ago</b> [1] - 64:15 <b>agree</b> [19] - 8:6, 9:1, 10:4, 17:8, 28:1, 29:20, 33:22, 53:20, 59:20, 64:6, 65:7, 65:22, 67:12, 68:8, 70:21, 71:16, 74:20, 74:22 <b>agreed</b> [12] - 4:14, 4:16, 7:12, 7:15, 8:4, 9:7, 13:17, 13:22, 59:8, 65:6, 71:14, 71:18 <b>agreement</b> [21] - 7:3, 7:10, 7:21, 7:22, 7:23, 8:21, 8:24, 10:13, 12:13, 14:8, 15:13, 15:14, 34:23, 39:1, 48:15, 49:11, 50:25, 56:18, 64:4, 68:21, 72:25 <b>agreements</b> [13] - 10:7, 22:5, 22:7, 23:10, 27:17, 27:19, 36:5, 37:23, 37:24, 38:22, 39:3, 43:7, 43:24 <b>al</b> [1] - 1:9 <b>ALA</b> [6] - 8:11, 9:14, 9:17, 9:19, 9:20, 10:2, 10:10, 11:4, 12:3, 13:9, 13:11, 13:15, 13:18, 13:20, 14:3, 14:7, 14:8, 14:13, 14:15, 14:17, 14:19, 15:3, 15:7, 15:22, 15:24, 16:5, 16:6, 16:21, 17:1, 19:16, 20:4, 20:18, 20:20, 20:21, 21:10, 21:16, 22:19, 23:1, 23:4, 23:8, 24:2, 24:6, 26:22, 27:14, 28:7, 28:15, 34:15, 34:18, 41:19, 43:12, 77:3
<b>1</b> <b>1</b> [4] - 7:20, 8:2, 24:11, 74:1 <b>11</b> [4] - 35:14, 35:21, 35:22, 48:1 <b>114</b> [1] - 23:17 <b>115</b> [1] - 23:18 <b>12</b> [2] - 36:12, 36:13 <b>120(b)</b> [1] - 45:4 <b>12th</b> [2] - 71:17, 73:18 <b>13</b> [8] - 15:5, 23:12, 35:14, 36:16, 44:25, 45:7, 48:22, 49:2 <b>137</b> [1] - 25:17 <b>138</b> [1] - 25:17 <b>13th</b> [5] - 58:10, 60:5, 71:17, 72:18, 73:19 <b>14th</b> [1] - 48:6 <b>15</b> [1] - 14:4 <b>15.1</b> [8] - 8:11, 8:15, 8:22, 9:20, 54:1, 54:20, 55:1, 55:15 <b>16</b> [3] - 15:1, 45:4, 45:14 <b>16.3</b> [2] - 53:23, 54:10 <b>16th</b> [3] - 46:3, 46:8, 73:12 <b>1A</b> [1] - 25:15 <b>1st</b> [2] - 52:5, 52:14	<b>403</b> [2] - 12:24, 24:23 <b>41</b> [1] - 23:13 <b>48</b> [1] - 63:24 <b>49</b> [1] - 7:12	<b>4</b> <b>403</b> [2] - 12:24, 24:23 <b>41</b> [1] - 23:13 <b>48</b> [1] - 63:24 <b>49</b> [1] - 7:12	<b>5</b>  <b>51</b> [1] - 64:8 <b>52</b> [1] - 64:8 <b>56</b> [1] - 68:8 <b>585</b> [1] - 12:18
<b>2</b> <b>2</b> [6] - 10:9, 15:1, 17:12, 26:20, 49:3, 74:1 <b>20</b> [1] - 1:12 <b>200</b> [2] - 19:4, 19:19 <b>2015</b> [1] - 33:8 <b>2022</b> [1] - 14:4 <b>2023</b> [1] - 66:6 <b>2024</b> [2] - 1:12, 67:5 <b>2025</b> [1] - 54:7 <b>21</b> [4] - 12:15, 12:16, 13:13, 14:4 <b>22-1146(MN</b> [1] - 1:6 <b>223</b> [1] - 12:18 <b>22nd</b> [6] - 10:10, 10:20, 11:19, 13:23, 14:20, 17:1 <b>23rd</b> [2] - 52:5, 52:14	<b>6</b> [1] - 33:4 <b>602</b> [1] - 62:16 <b>68</b> [1] - 68:24	<b>6</b> <b>7</b> [1] - 33:7 <b>72</b> [1] - 7:14 <b>78</b> [1] - 70:12 <b>79</b> [1] - 70:13	<b>7</b> <b>80</b> [1] - 25:14 <b>844</b> [1] - 1:15 <b>89</b> [1] - 39:3
<b>2</b> <b>2</b> [6] - 10:9, 15:1, 17:12, 26:20, 49:3, 74:1 <b>20</b> [1] - 1:12 <b>200</b> [2] - 19:4, 19:19 <b>2015</b> [1] - 33:8 <b>2022</b> [1] - 14:4 <b>2023</b> [1] - 66:6 <b>2024</b> [2] - 1:12, 67:5 <b>2025</b> [1] - 54:7 <b>21</b> [4] - 12:15, 12:16, 13:13, 14:4 <b>22-1146(MN</b> [1] - 1:6 <b>223</b> [1] - 12:18 <b>22nd</b> [6] - 10:10, 10:20, 11:19, 13:23, 14:20, 17:1 <b>23rd</b> [2] - 52:5, 52:14	<b>900</b> [2] - 60:12, 60:17 <b>95</b> [1] - 72:20	<b>8</b>  <b>80</b> [1] - 25:14 <b>844</b> [1] - 1:15 <b>89</b> [1] - 39:3	<b>9</b> <b>900</b> [2] - 60:12, 60:17 <b>95</b> [1] - 72:20

<p><b>applies</b> [1] - 20:7  <b>appreciate</b> [4] - 3:24, 4:22, 27:2, 62:8  <b>appropriate</b> [1] - 72:10  <b>approval</b> [1] - 53:7  <b>April</b> [2] - 51:9, 67:5  <b>argue</b> [6] - 8:21, 9:18, 17:9, 20:2, 21:3, 43:18  <b>argues</b> [1] - 32:25  <b>arguing</b> [5] - 15:25, 17:5, 38:21, 40:12, 46:24  <b>argument</b> [9] - 8:3, 8:25, 9:25, 22:7, 31:19, 34:22, 42:18, 43:22, 47:11  <b>arguments</b> [3] - 8:7, 14:23, 26:21  <b>ARM</b> [67] - 1:4, 3:6, 7:20, 8:18, 8:23, 9:7, 9:9, 9:14, 9:18, 9:20, 10:1, 10:11, 13:11, 13:15, 14:1, 14:5, 14:7, 14:23, 15:1, 15:20, 16:18, 17:17, 18:17, 18:18, 19:2, 19:7, 19:9, 19:14, 21:3, 21:18, 21:24, 22:12, 22:18, 22:20, 23:3, 23:12, 23:20, 24:5, 24:6, 25:4, 25:23, 26:4, 26:21, 28:3, 28:6, 29:17, 33:6, 33:7, 34:4, 34:6, 34:8, 34:10, 43:22, 48:5, 48:24, 53:17, 54:23, 54:24, 56:2, 56:7, 56:9, 59:11, 63:17, 64:11, 68:13, 69:22</p> <p><b>ARM's</b> [24] - 8:7, 8:12, 8:13, 10:8, 11:20, 13:19, 17:2, 18:20, 22:9, 23:24, 25:10, 33:5, 33:9, 33:10, 33:11, 34:8, 34:13, 52:25, 54:6, 55:2, 56:19, 56:23, 69:14, 70:3</p> <p><b>ARM-based</b> [1] - 23:20</p> <p><b>arrangements</b> [1] - 20:24</p> <p><b>arrive</b> [1] - 42:17</p> <p><b>ARSHT</b> [1] - 2:10</p> <p><b>assert</b> [4] - 10:25, 11:2, 16:25, 47:4</p> <p><b>asserting</b> [1] - 44:16</p>	<p><b>assertion</b> [1] - 49:4  <b>assessment</b> [1] - 22:20  <b>assume</b> [2] - 39:23, 50:13  <b>assure</b> [1] - 69:7  <b>attack</b> [1] - 41:17  <b>attempting</b> [1] - 21:24  <b>attempts</b> [1] - 22:6  <b>attention</b> [2] - 32:9, 46:7  <b>attorney's</b> [1] - 45:17  <b>August</b> [1] - 32:22  <b>availability</b> [1] - 51:22  <b>awards</b> [1] - 30:17  <b>aware</b> [1] - 4:16  <b>awful</b> [1] - 76:2  <b>awfully</b> [1] - 40:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p><b>bad</b> [3] - 22:2, 38:1, 71:9  <b>based</b> [17] - 12:12, 13:8, 13:9, 23:20, 25:12, 33:7, 33:21, 46:22, 50:14, 50:20, 55:6, 55:18, 55:19, 56:14, 57:7  <b>basis</b> [7] - 9:14, 55:7, 55:20, 68:16, 69:7, 72:10  <b>Bates</b> [5] - 9:10, 9:21, 59:17, 62:6, 62:21  <b>bearing</b> [2] - 9:23, 9:24  <b>BEFORE</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>beginning</b> [2] - 13:12, 13:25  <b>behalf</b> [4] - 3:6, 7:8, 24:16, 64:11  <b>behind</b> [3] - 3:17, 3:18, 18:20  <b>belabor</b> [1] - 34:21  <b>belaboring</b> [1] - 34:11  <b>bench</b> [2] - 36:10  <b>best</b> [1] - 73:22  <b>better</b> [2] - 29:8, 39:4  <b>between</b> [14] - 8:11, 12:6, 20:3, 20:15, 20:20, 22:1, 22:8, 22:14, 22:19, 22:25, 39:10, 41:4, 52:14, 54:20  <b>beyond</b> [2] - 69:13, 70:2  <b>bias</b> [4] - 24:23, 26:9, 26:17, 26:19  <b>big</b> [4] - 20:11, 32:21, 59:14, 59:20</p>	<p><b>binder</b> [2] - 74:8, 74:11  <b>binders</b> [4] - 74:14, 74:15, 74:21, 74:22  <b>bit</b> [3] - 26:24, 32:5, 65:5  <b>bits</b> [1] - 58:19  <b>blessed</b> [1] - 28:17  <b>BLUMENFELD</b> [22] - 2:10, 3:12, 3:14, 24:12, 31:24, 32:12, 32:20, 35:1, 35:11, 36:16, 38:2, 44:1, 44:12, 44:22, 44:25, 45:3, 45:7, 45:10, 45:14, 46:18, 72:24, 73:10  <b>briefing</b> [3] - 5:7, 46:2, 54:9  <b>briefs</b> [1] - 75:7  <b>bring</b> [2] - 46:6, 73:15  <b>bringing</b> [3] - 34:14, 41:17, 57:1  <b>brought</b> [5] - 5:15, 34:4, 40:24, 41:3, 41:21  <b>Buckson</b> [3] - 72:19, 73:24, 74:5  <b>build</b> [1] - 23:7  <b>bunch</b> [1] - 71:15  <b>buried</b> [2] - 67:20, 67:22  <b>business</b> [20] - 20:24, 23:14, 33:8, 35:10, 37:3, 37:7, 37:19, 41:9, 41:24, 42:7, 62:4, 62:6, 62:7, 62:10, 62:12, 62:13, 62:14, 62:21, 63:25, 64:23, 65:5, 66:1, 67:15, 68:24, 69:5, 70:6, 71:5, 73:13, 75:2, 76:8  <b>case-in-chief</b> [3] - 69:5, 69:23, 69:25  <b>cash</b> [1] - 25:18  <b>categories</b> [1] - 57:12  <b>Catherine</b> [2] - 3:16, 13:6  <b>CATHERINE</b> [1] - 2:14  <b>caught</b> [1] - 32:9  <b>caused</b> [1] - 33:5  <b>center</b> [1] - 10:19  <b>Century</b> [2] - 12:15, 12:16  <b>CEO</b> [1] - 69:3  <b>CEOs</b> [1] - 48:5  <b>certain</b> [1] - 19:12  <b>certainly</b> [2] - 5:22, 52:14  <b>certify</b> [1] - 77:5  <b>chambers</b> [1] - 52:5  <b>chance</b> [1] - 65:11  <b>change</b> [1] - 76:3  <b>changes</b> [1] - 59:16  <b>check</b> [1] - 35:16  <b>chief</b> [3] - 69:5, 69:23, 69:25  <b>chose</b> [1] - 65:11  <b>Chris</b> [1] - 3:19  <b>Circuit</b> [3] - 12:16, 17:21, 71:23  <b>circumstances</b> [1] - 12:22  <b>cites</b> [1] - 12:16  <b>claim</b> [13] - 17:2, 27:25, 29:1, 29:22, 30:6, 30:25, 44:16, 52:25, 53:4, 53:19, 54:10, 54:15, 57:1  <b>claims</b> [11] - 4:4, 4:12, 4:16, 5:1, 5:5, 11:3, 17:18, 20:6, 24:21, 54:7, 54:14  <b>clarification</b> [2] - 67:18, 72:16  <b>clear</b> [16] - 10:21, 21:3, 21:12, 24:24, 26:7, 30:23, 35:24, 40:2, 40:24, 56:2, 56:11, 62:14, 62:19, 63:4, 63:18, 63:19  <b>client</b> [1] - 51:22  <b>closed</b> [3] - 56:8, 56:9, 72:1  <b>closing</b> [2] - 26:2, 53:15  <b>colleagues</b> [1] - 3:9  <b>collect</b> [1] - 38:13  <b>collected</b> [1] - 9:13  <b>colloquy</b> [1] - 44:13  <b>combination</b> [1] - 22:5  <b>coming</b> [3] - 10:6, 61:6, 71:15</p>
--	--	--

<b>commercializing</b> [1] - 11:21	<b>consulted</b> [1] - 51:22	<b>couple</b> [3] - 31:24, 68:4, 75:15	<b>71:21, 72:15, 73:9, 73:11, 75:1, 75:11, 75:18, 76:1, 76:12, 76:23, 76:25</b>	<b>damaged</b> [3] - 28:23, 35:18, 53:10
<b>committee</b> [1] - 66:10	<b>consumption</b> [1] - 72:14	<b>course</b> [3] - 25:18, 62:12, 69:11	<b>Court</b> [18] - 1:18, 2:25, 4:18, 17:20, 30:16, 50:9, 52:1, 52:12, 52:13, 52:17, 54:8, 57:13, 69:8, 70:16, 72:22, 77:7, 77:8	<b>damages</b> [23] - 5:23, 5:24, 6:1, 6:2, 28:21, 30:5, 30:14, 30:25, 31:16, 31:25, 37:17, 44:14, 44:16, 44:18, 44:19, 45:17, 45:22, 45:23, 45:25, 46:8, 46:12
<b>communications</b> [1] - 8:15	<b>Cont'd</b> [1] - 2:1	<b>court</b> [6] - 39:17, 75:5, 76:14, 76:18, 77:1, 77:3	<b>Court's</b> [2] - 24:12, 63:18	<b>DANIEL</b> [2] - 1:24, 2:4
<b>companies</b> [2] - 27:15, 54:21	<b>contact</b> [1] - 72:19	<b>COURT</b> [175] - 1:1, 3:2, 3:11, 3:13, 3:20, 4:5, 4:13, 4:19, 4:21, 5:2, 5:9, 5:12, 6:19, 6:25, 7:18, 7:24, 9:1, 9:3, 10:3, 10:6, 10:16, 10:21, 11:7, 11:10, 11:14, 11:19, 13:3, 13:17, 15:9, 15:17, 15:25, 16:9, 16:13, 16:24, 17:11, 17:23, 18:1, 18:4, 18:10, 18:15, 19:3, 23:23, 24:10, 24:14, 25:13, 25:20, 26:12, 26:15, 28:1, 28:8, 28:21, 29:5, 29:25, 30:19, 31:1, 31:10, 31:12, 32:9, 32:15, 33:20, 34:1, 34:25, 35:5, 35:16, 35:21, 35:23, 36:3, 36:23, 37:10, 38:19, 38:24, 39:8, 39:13, 39:15, 39:22, 40:7, 41:4, 42:2, 43:2, 43:11, 43:21, 44:7, 44:20, 44:24, 45:2, 45:5, 45:9, 45:13, 46:9, 46:20, 47:3, 47:13, 48:12, 48:17, 48:20, 49:2, 49:8, 49:15, 49:18, 50:13, 51:3, 51:8, 51:12, 52:4, 52:9, 52:19, 53:3, 53:6, 53:10, 53:16, 53:19, 54:12, 55:1, 55:5, 55:15, 55:18, 55:20, 56:13, 56:21, 57:2, 57:14, 57:20, 57:23, 58:16, 58:25, 59:6, 59:12, 59:19, 59:23, 60:7, 60:17, 61:11, 61:14, 61:21, 62:22, 62:24, 63:6, 63:9, 63:22, 64:2, 64:4, 64:8, 65:14, 65:17, 65:19, 66:2, 66:17, 66:23, 67:1, 67:12, 67:15, 67:22, 68:2, 68:6, 68:8, 68:17, 69:22, 70:4, 70:9, 70:12, 70:20, 70:24, 71:2, 71:7,	<b>Daniel</b> [2] - 3:8, 3:10	
<b>company</b> [1] - 37:22	<b>contend</b> [1] - 43:6	<b>contested</b> [1] - 27:16	<b>COURTROOM</b> [2] - 2:24, 77:1	<b>DARALYN</b> [1] - 2:3
<b>compel</b> [1] - 47:24	<b>context</b> [2] - 6:18, 12:21	<b>continue</b> [1] - 48:21	<b>courtroom</b> [6] - 68:21, 71:21, 71:22, 72:1, 72:4, 72:17	<b>Daralyn</b> [2] - 3:7, 25:22
<b>compensated</b> [7] - 19:22, 20:13, 21:4, 28:4, 30:8, 31:3, 31:20	<b>continued</b> [2] - 58:10, 58:23	<b>continuing</b> [2] - 53:17, 60:4	<b>cover</b> [3] - 7:9, 7:12, 7:14	<b>date</b> [5] - 33:25, 43:14, 43:15, 49:12, 60:2
<b>compensating</b> [1] - 30:10	<b>contract</b> [15] - 6:2, 12:9, 12:11, 12:12, 12:20, 27:24, 29:1, 29:13, 29:22, 30:6, 30:24, 54:15, 54:18, 56:11	<b>contract</b> [2] - 18:23, 33:10	<b>coverage</b> [1] - 14:9	<b>Daubert</b> [2] - 5:13, 47:16
<b>compensation</b> [7] - 25:1, 29:3, 29:4, 31:4, 45:18, 45:23, 45:24	<b>contractual</b> [1] - 26:2	<b>contracts</b> [2] - 35:25	<b>covered</b> [1] - 14:16	<b>Daubert's</b> [2] - 47:17, 47:21
<b>completed</b> [1] - 19:10	<b>conversations</b> [1] - 75:25	<b>convince</b> [2] - 31:2	<b>covers</b> [1] - 13:9	<b>DAWSON</b> [1] - 2:4
<b>comply</b> [2] - 8:13, 33:13	<b>coordinate</b> [1] - 73:23	<b>coordinate</b> [1] - 31:2	<b>CPU</b> [2] - 11:21, 19:10	<b>Dawson</b> [1] - 3:7
<b>CONAWAY</b> [1] - 1:22	<b>copies</b> [3] - 60:3, 73:15, 74:17	<b>copies</b> [3] - 31:2	<b>CPUs</b> [2] - 54:5, 55:2	<b>days</b> [2] - 58:1, 72:7
<b>Conaway</b> [1] - 3:6	<b>core</b> [1] - 19:15	<b>core</b> [1] - 31:2	<b>create</b> [2] - 19:20, 44:5	<b>deal</b> [16] - 5:9, 5:19, 6:23, 43:17, 44:2, 49:9, 49:21, 49:22, 49:23, 51:6, 52:6, 58:2, 58:3, 58:18, 59:20, 75:7
<b>concern</b> [6] - 19:18, 21:17, 32:22, 36:24, 36:25, 62:25	<b>cores</b> [4] - 19:7, 19:10, 19:11, 20:25	<b>core</b> [1] - 31:2	<b>created</b> [4] - 62:11, 62:12, 62:17, 63:3	<b>deals</b> [1] - 29:8
<b>concerned</b> [1] - 41:25	<b>corporate</b> [4] - 68:9, 68:12, 68:19, 68:22	<b>corporate</b> [2] - 1:5, 1:8	<b>creates</b> [1] - 12:23	<b>December</b> [4] - 46:3, 46:8, 72:18, 73:19
<b>concerns</b> [1] - 6:23	<b>corporation</b> [2] - 1:5, 1:8	<b>correct</b> [9] - 10:17, 21:6, 32:1, 33:24, 35:20, 53:5, 60:2, 62:23, 64:3	<b>creating</b> [1] - 12:24	<b>decide</b> [5] - 6:5, 6:17, 16:13, 52:17, 75:18
<b>conclusion</b> [1] - 72:8	<b>correcting</b> [1] - 59:17	<b>correct</b> [9] - 10:17, 21:6, 32:1, 33:24, 35:20, 53:5, 60:2, 62:23, 64:3	<b>credit</b> [1] - 21:14	<b>decided</b> [2] - 32:4, 52:2
<b>conduct</b> [4] - 21:4, 26:10, 28:17, 40:25	<b>corrections</b> [1] - 75:5	<b>correcting</b> [1] - 59:17	<b>cross</b> [17] - 27:9, 33:16, 33:19, 38:4, 38:16, 40:14, 42:5, 42:25	<b>deciding</b> [1] - 51:20
<b>confer</b> [5] - 58:10, 58:23, 63:8, 63:16	<b>correspondence</b> [1] - 8:11	<b>corrections</b> [1] - 75:5	<b>cross-examination</b> [2] - 42:5, 73:6	<b>decision</b> [3] - 29:17, 51:1, 57:7
<b>Conference</b> [1] - 1:13	<b>costs</b> [1] - 45:18	<b>correspondence</b> [1] - 8:11	<b>cross-examine</b> [8] - 27:9, 33:16, 33:19, 34:24, 38:4, 38:16, 40:14, 42:25	<b>declaration</b> [5] - 32:6, 33:2, 35:15, 36:18, 36:20
<b>conference</b> [4] - 16:14, 55:10, 72:20, 72:21	<b>counsel</b> [4] - 3:15, 48:16, 70:21, 72:23	<b>costs</b> [1] - 45:18	<b>cross-examining</b> [1] - 69:15	<b>declarations</b> [1] - 32:21
<b>conferred</b> [1] - 61:1	<b>Counsel</b> [2] - 2:7, 2:17	<b>counsel</b> [4] - 3:15, 48:16, 70:21, 72:23	<b>crux</b> [1] - 69:1	<b>declaratory</b> [2] - 18:2, 56:18
<b>conferring</b> [1] - 58:25	<b>counsels</b> [1] - 48:7	<b>Counsel</b> [2] - 2:7, 2:17	<b>cure</b> [2] - 12:5, 12:6	<b>decreased</b> [2] - 32:13, 32:17
<b>confidential</b> [2] - 10:1, 53:18	<b>counterclaim</b> [5] - 13:9, 14:1, 67:4, 67:7, 76:4	<b>counsels</b> [1] - 48:7	<b>cured</b> [1] - 12:7	<b>deemed</b> [1] - 62:4
<b>confirm</b> [1] - 52:11	<b>counterclaims</b> [3] - 4:1, 6:14, 70:17	<b>counterclaim</b> [5] - 13:9, 14:1, 67:4, 67:7, 76:4	<b>current</b> [2] - 21:15, 24:2	<b>defendant</b> [3] - 8:5, 61:22, 69:24
<b>confirms</b> [1] - 15:1	<b>counterproductive</b> [1] - 71:8	<b>counterclaims</b> [3] - 4:1, 6:14, 70:17	<b>custom</b> [1] - 11:21	<b>defendants</b> [33] - 3:25, 5:15, 7:8, 8:6, 8:10, 8:20, 8:21, 9:1, 9:12, 9:25, 10:14, 11:20, 13:4, 17:2, 17:5, 18:17, 18:19, 19:19, 20:2, 21:3, 24:16, 26:16, 26:21,
<b>conflict</b> [1] - 72:23		<b>counterproductive</b> [1] - 71:8	<b>customer</b> [2] - 22:12, 56:20	
<b>confused</b> [1] - 5:17			<b>customers</b> [1] - 55:25	
<b>confusing</b> [2] - 17:3, 21:19				
<b>connection</b> [2] - 7:16, 12:1			<b>D</b>	
<b>consent</b> [8] - 16:18, 20:5, 24:5, 26:3, 26:4, 34:14, 41:19			<b>Dale</b> [1] - 77:7	
<b>consequence</b> [3] - 39:10, 39:20, 42:22			<b>damage</b> [5] - 30:3, 30:7, 39:23, 39:25	
<b>consequences</b> [4] - 28:19, 34:10, 39:12, 41:25				
<b>constitute</b> [1] - 10:1				
<b>constitutes</b> [1] - 9:19				

<p>40:14, 43:22, 45:15, 48:17, 48:23, 63:5, 69:25, 72:21, 76:24</p> <p><b>Defendants</b> [2] - 1:10, 2:17</p> <p><b>defendants'</b> [6] - 7:13, 7:15, 7:22, 9:5, 24:4, 63:22</p> <p><b>defense</b> [18] - 11:24, 12:2, 13:8, 13:9, 14:2, 15:13, 16:2, 16:8, 16:10, 18:21, 24:5, 54:16, 54:17, 55:21, 56:5, 56:7, 56:25</p> <p><b>defenses</b> [6] - 53:2, 53:3, 53:20, 54:3, 55:16</p> <p><b>Defilippi</b> [6] - 65:9, 65:12, 65:23, 65:25, 66:24</p> <p><b>definitely</b> [1] - 72:3</p> <p><b>DELAWARE</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>Delaware</b> [3] - 1:8, 1:15, 2:25</p> <p><b>deletions</b> [1] - 59:4</p> <p><b>demonstrate</b> [1] - 23:9</p> <p><b>demonstratives</b> [4] - 7:13, 63:24, 64:5, 74:9</p> <p><b>denial</b> [1] - 47:13</p> <p><b>denied</b> [3] - 23:25, 24:3, 54:24</p> <p><b>denies</b> [1] - 9:22</p> <p><b>deny</b> [5] - 5:16, 6:20, 20:5, 26:15, 72:3</p> <p><b>denying</b> [1] - 47:22</p> <p><b>departments</b> [1] - 73:23</p> <p><b>depose</b> [2] - 65:11, 67:16</p> <p><b>deposed</b> [1] - 65:5</p> <p><b>deposition</b> [21] - 5:18, 5:19, 7:17, 58:12, 59:1, 60:25, 65:13, 65:14, 66:5, 66:12, 66:15, 67:6, 67:8, 67:11, 67:12, 67:25, 68:4, 69:20, 74:13, 76:15</p> <p><b>depositions</b> [1] - 66:20</p> <p><b>depth</b> [1] - 22:13</p> <p><b>DEPUTY</b> [2] - 2:24, 77:1</p> <p><b>describe</b> [1] - 27:13</p> <p><b>describes</b> [1] - 25:17</p> <p><b>designations</b> [5] - 58:12, 59:1, 60:25, 61:5, 61:9</p>	<p><b>desired</b> [1] - 49:17</p> <p><b>destroy</b> [3] - 8:18, 16:2, 16:3</p> <p><b>destroyed</b> [1] - 53:13</p> <p><b>destruction</b> [2] - 8:22, 8:23</p> <p><b>details</b> [1] - 27:22</p> <p><b>determination</b> [4] - 12:10, 14:16, 29:21, 71:12</p> <p><b>determine</b> [2] - 12:12, 50:19</p> <p><b>determines</b> [1] - 70:16</p> <p><b>develop</b> [3] - 13:13, 22:24, 23:7</p> <p><b>developed</b> [4] - 15:4, 19:10, 19:15, 26:5</p> <p><b>development</b> [1] - 26:5</p> <p><b>devices</b> [1] - 23:20</p> <p><b>DI</b> [3] - 13:13, 14:4, 14:12</p> <p><b>dictionary</b> [1] - 45:24</p> <p><b>difference</b> [5] - 22:19, 22:25, 23:8, 23:9, 41:4</p> <p><b>different</b> [16] - 19:15, 23:10, 24:3, 27:15, 36:14, 37:12, 37:14, 41:13, 42:3, 55:8, 58:20, 61:18, 63:20, 63:21, 69:11, 75:1</p> <p><b>differential</b> [4] - 20:3, 20:7, 20:15, 20:20</p> <p><b>difficult</b> [1] - 71:24</p> <p><b>dire</b> [4] - 73:14, 73:15, 75:16, 75:20</p> <p><b>direct</b> [1] - 74:10</p> <p><b>directly</b> [2] - 16:22, 22:15</p> <p><b>disagree</b> [2] - 29:15, 39:7</p> <p><b>disclose</b> [2] - 32:24, 36:11</p> <p><b>disclosed</b> [8] - 7:14, 45:19, 65:10, 66:12, 66:14, 67:1, 67:3, 67:19</p> <p><b>disclosers</b> [1] - 65:21</p> <p><b>disclosing</b> [2] - 7:16, 25:5</p> <p><b>disclosure</b> [1] - 44:19</p> <p><b>disclosures</b> [6] - 64:14, 65:10, 65:19, 66:13, 67:2, 67:4</p> <p><b>discontinue</b> [1] - 8:16</p> <p><b>discovery</b> [7] - 27:11, 32:25, 36:11, 65:11, 66:9, 66:18, 67:20</p> <p><b>discuss</b> [4] - 50:12,</p>	<p>63:15, 72:22, 75:12</p> <p><b>discussed</b> [2] - 18:8, 50:9</p> <p><b>discussion</b> [4] - 6:10, 26:24, 51:25, 60:4</p> <p><b>discussions</b> [3] - 12:5, 48:2, 48:8</p> <p><b>disgorgement</b> [3] - 48:24, 49:5, 50:17</p> <p><b>dismissed</b> [2] - 4:6, 4:7</p> <p><b>dispute</b> [10] - 18:5, 19:24, 61:7, 64:2, 65:5, 65:21, 69:1, 70:14, 70:19, 74:19, 74:25, 75:10, 75:14</p> <p><b>disregarding</b> [1] - 26:1</p> <p><b>disrespect</b> [1] - 63:18</p> <p><b>dissatisfied</b> [1] - 24:6</p> <p><b>distinct</b> [1] - 30:25</p> <p><b>distinction</b> [3] - 39:9, 39:10, 63:4</p> <p><b>distribution</b> [1] - 8:17</p> <p><b>DISTRICT</b> [2] - 1:1, 1:2</p> <p><b>District</b> [4] - 1:18, 2:25, 77:8</p> <p><b>DJ</b> [2] - 17:17, 54:7</p> <p><b>document</b> [5] - 3:22, 60:18, 62:11, 62:17, 62:20</p> <p><b>documents</b> [22] - 9:6, 9:8, 9:10, 9:12, 9:13, 9:16, 9:19, 9:23, 9:24, 10:1, 22:21, 27:9, 40:18, 42:15, 56:2, 61:21, 62:3, 62:5, 62:6, 62:14, 63:2, 74:21</p> <p><b>dollar</b> [1] - 24:18</p> <p><b>done</b> [7] - 15:24, 22:18, 22:24, 23:6, 51:14, 58:21, 73:13</p> <p><b>door</b> [1] - 11:16</p> <p><b>doubt</b> [2] - 19:23, 20:14</p> <p><b>down</b> [2] - 61:3, 71:9</p> <p><b>downstream</b> [2] - 13:1, 34:10</p> <p><b>draft</b> [2] - 5:13, 17:16</p> <p><b>dramatic</b> [1] - 67:22</p> <p><b>draw</b> [3] - 39:9, 41:12, 63:5</p> <p><b>drive</b> [2] - 73:22, 74:12</p> <p><b>drop</b> [1] - 4:16</p> <p><b>dropped</b> [4] - 5:1, 6:14, 67:5, 76:5</p> <p><b>dropping</b> [4] - 4:1, 4:4, 4:9, 4:22</p> <p><b>due</b> [1] - 60:6</p>	<p><b>dumb</b> [1] - 15:18</p> <p><b>Dunn</b> [3] - 3:16, 17:13, 42:8</p> <p><b>DUNN</b> [41] - 2:13, 4:3, 4:11, 4:15, 4:20, 4:25, 5:8, 5:10, 9:2, 11:8, 11:12, 11:18, 17:15, 17:25, 18:2, 18:7, 18:11, 18:19, 18:25, 19:1, 19:11, 19:15, 19:20, 19:24, 19:25, 20:1, 20:11, 20:15, 20:20, 20:24, 20:25, 21:1, 21:11, 21:15, 21:20, 21:24, 21:25, 22:1, 22:11, 22:15, 22:20, 22:24, 22:25, 23:1, 23:11, 23:15, 23:20, 23:24, 23:25, 24:1, 24:11, 24:15, 24:20, 24:24, 24:25, 25:1, 25:11, 25:15, 25:20, 25:24, 25:25, 26:1, 26:11, 26:15, 26:20, 26:24, 26:25, 27:1, 27:11, 27:15, 27:20, 27:24, 27:25, 28:1, 28:11, 28:15, 28:20, 28:24, 28:25, 29:1, 29:11, 29:15, 29:20, 29:24, 29:25, 30:1, 30:11, 30:15, 30:20, 30:24, 30:25, 31:1, 31:11, 31:15, 31:20, 31:24, 31:25, 32:1, 32:11, 32:15, 32:20, 32:24, 32:25, 33:1, 33:11, 33:15, 33:20, 33:24, 33:25, 34:1, 34:11, 34:15, 34:20, 34:24, 34:25, 35:1, 35:11, 35:15, 35:20, 35:24, 35:25, 36:1, 36:11, 36:15, 36:20, 36:24, 36:25, 37:1, 37:11, 37:15, 37:20, 37:24, 37:25, 38:1, 38:11, 38:15, 38:20, 38:24, 38:25, 39:1, 39:11, 39:15, 39:20, 39:24, 39:25, 40:1, 40:11, 40:15, 40:20, 40:24, 40:25, 41:1, 41:11, 41:15, 41:20, 41:24, 41:25, 42:1, 42:11, 42:15, 42:20, 42:24, 42:25, 43:1, 43:11, 43:15, 43:20, 43:24, 43:25, 44:1, 44:11, 44:15, 44:20, 44:24, 44:25, 45:1, 45:11, 45:15, 45:20, 45:24, 45:25, 46:1, 46:11, 46:15, 46:20, 46:24, 46:25, 47:1, 47:11, 47:15, 47:20, 47:24, 47:25, 48:1, 48:11, 48:15, 48:20, 48:24, 48:25, 49:1, 49:11, 49:15, 49:20, 49:24, 49:25, 50:1, 50:11, 50:15, 50:20, 50:24, 50:25, 51:1, 51:11, 51:15, 51:20, 51:24, 51:25, 52:1, 52:11, 52:15, 52:20, 52:24, 52:25, 53:1, 53:11, 53:15, 53:20, 53:24, 53:25, 54:1, 54:11, 54:15, 54:20, 54:24, 54:25, 55:1, 55:11, 55:15, 55:20, 55:24, 55:25, 56:1, 56:11, 56:15, 56:20, 56:24, 56:25, 57:1, 57:11, 57:15, 57:20, 57:24, 57:25, 58:1, 58:11, 58:15, 58:20, 58:24, 58:25, 59:1, 59:11, 59:15, 59:20, 59:24, 59:25, 60:1, 60:11, 60:15, 60:20, 60:24, 60:25, 61:1, 61:11, 61:15, 61:20, 61:24, 61:25, 62:1, 62:11, 62:15, 62:20, 62:24, 62:25, 63:1, 63:11, 63:15, 63:20, 63:24, 63:25, 64:1, 64:11, 64:15, 64:20, 64:24, 64:25, 65:1, 65:11, 65:15, 65:20, 65:24, 65:25, 66:1, 66:11, 66:15, 66:20, 66:24, 66:25, 67:1, 67:11, 67:15, 67:20, 67:24, 67:25, 68:1, 68:11, 68:15, 68:20, 68:24, 68:25, 69:1, 69:11, 69:15, 69:20, 69:24, 69:25, 70:1, 70:11, 70:15, 70:20, 70:24, 70:25, 71:1, 71:11, 71:15, 71:20, 71:24, 71:25, 72:1, 72:11, 72:15, 72:20, 72:24, 72:25, 73:1, 73:11, 73:15, 73:20, 73:24, 73:25, 74:1, 74:11, 74:15, 74:20, 74:24, 74:25, 75:1, 75:1</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>2:4, 2:5, 2:5, 2:6, 2:10, 2:11, 2:13, 2:14, 2:14, 2:15, 2:15, 2:16, 2:16</p> <p><b>establish</b> [1] - 43:5</p> <p><b>establishes</b> [1] - 41:11</p> <p><b>et</b> [1] - 1:9</p> <p><b>evening</b> [1] - 50:6</p> <p><b>evenings</b> [3] - 49:24, 50:21, 51:15</p> <p><b>evidence</b> [29] - 4:8, 8:3, 8:7, 8:10, 8:25, 10:9, 11:3, 11:23, 12:14, 12:20, 18:16, 21:17, 22:13, 22:18, 23:1, 24:18, 24:20, 24:25, 25:8, 25:24, 26:8, 26:9, 27:16, 27:20, 37:21, 46:5, 49:13, 56:25, 64:6</p> <p><b>evidences</b> [1] - 11:20</p> <p><b>exactly</b> [1] - 41:11</p> <p><b>examination</b> [2] - 42:5, 73:6</p> <p><b>examine</b> [10] - 8:13, 9:15, 27:9, 33:16, 33:19, 34:24, 38:4, 38:16, 40:14, 42:25</p> <p><b>examining</b> [1] - 69:15</p> <p><b>example</b> [6] - 16:18, 20:3, 33:11, 38:5, 59:25, 66:11</p> <p><b>exams</b> [1] - 74:10</p> <p><b>except</b> [1] - 47:21</p> <p><b>exchange</b> [1] - 68:11</p> <p><b>exchanged</b> [1] - 58:13</p> <p><b>exclude</b> [3] - 18:16, 24:18, 24:24</p> <p><b>excluded</b> [2] - 21:1, 68:20</p> <p><b>excluding</b> [1] - 10:9</p> <p><b>executives</b> [3] - 32:2, 32:7, 48:8</p> <p><b>exhibit</b> [8] - 21:14, 45:5, 58:7, 58:11, 59:16, 73:21, 74:1, 74:8</p> <p><b>Exhibit</b> [7] - 15:1, 15:5, 23:12, 25:15, 44:25, 45:7, 49:3</p> <p><b>exhibits</b> [10] - 58:6, 59:1, 59:22, 60:16, 72:9, 72:13, 73:21, 73:24, 73:25, 74:7</p> <p><b>exigent</b> [2] - 28:24, 38:22</p> <p><b>existing</b> [1] - 12:11</p> <p><b>expect</b> [3] - 34:10, 48:20, 60:9</p>	<p><b>expected</b> [1] - 36:6</p> <p><b>expects</b> [1] - 52:13</p> <p><b>experience</b> [1] - 33:7</p> <p><b>expert</b> [4] - 6:3, 6:6, 44:18, 60:1</p> <p><b>expertise</b> [1] - 6:7</p> <p><b>experts</b> [1] - 68:20</p> <p><b>expire</b> [2] - 56:1, 56:20</p> <p><b>expires</b> [1] - 54:6</p> <p><b>explain</b> [1] - 33:6</p> <p><b>explanation</b> [1] - 30:1</p> <p><b>extent</b> [9] - 6:21, 24:1, 28:16, 36:4, 43:23, 47:23, 55:11, 69:23, 74:11</p> <p><b>extremely</b> [1] - 34:5</p>	<p><b>filings</b> [2] - 58:10, 61:2</p> <p><b>financial</b> [1] - 33:15</p> <p><b>fine</b> [5] - 17:14, 56:13, 70:10, 74:16, 74:21</p> <p><b>finish</b> [2] - 16:15, 69:15</p> <p><b>firms</b> [1] - 76:8</p> <p><b>first</b> [9] - 10:13, 18:11, 49:22, 53:23, 55:22, 59:14, 64:11, 64:14, 73:25</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><b>fixing</b> [1] - 59:16</p> <p><b>flagged</b> [1] - 60:5</p> <p><b>flash</b> [2] - 73:22, 74:12</p> <p><b>FLINT</b> [1] - 2:16</p> <p><b>Flint</b> [1] - 3:18</p> <p><b>floor</b> [1] - 7:19</p> <p><b>FOERSTER</b> [1] - 2:2</p> <p><b>Foerster</b> [1] - 3:9</p> <p><b>Foerster's</b> [1] - 48:15</p> <p><b>folder</b> [1] - 73:21</p> <p><b>folders</b> [2] - 74:6</p> <p><b>folks</b> [1] - 26:19</p> <p><b>follow</b> [1] - 48:9</p> <p><b>follow-up</b> [1] - 48:9</p> <p><b>following</b> [4] - 9:9, 9:17, 48:7, 49:12</p> <p><b>FOR</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>foregoing</b> [1] - 77:5</p> <p><b>forgetting</b> [1] - 56:23</p> <p><b>form</b> [3] - 14:14, 14:17, 54:20</p> <p><b>formed</b> [1] - 23:3</p> <p><b>former</b> [1] - 69:3</p> <p><b>forms</b> [1] - 38:8</p> <p><b>forth</b> [2] - 23:12, 45:25</p> <p><b>forward</b> [1] - 28:19</p> <p><b>founders</b> [4] - 24:19, 25:1, 25:6, 25:25</p> <p><b>four</b> [3] - 20:21, 57:25, 65:6</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p><b>FUNG</b> [7] - 2:5, 64:10, 65:16, 65:18, 65:20, 67:17, 67:24</p> <p><b>Fung</b> [2] - 3:8, 64:10</p> <p><b>future</b> [13] - 6:2, 28:22, 29:12, 29:14, 29:16, 31:18, 32:3, 32:13, 39:1, 40:9, 41:6, 41:14, 42:1</p>	<p>29:21, 29:23, 30:24, 31:2, 31:7, 32:3, 38:17, 38:23, 38:25, 40:3, 40:5, 40:6, 43:6, 46:24, 46:25, 47:2, 47:5, 47:7</p> <p><b>harmed</b> [8] - 28:3, 29:8, 39:20, 40:22, 41:6, 41:14, 42:1</p> <p><b>harmful</b> [1] - 35:10</p> <p><b>harms</b> [1] - 33:5</p> <p><b>Hawkins</b> [1] - 77:7</p> <p><b>hear</b> [7] - 10:11, 13:3, 25:20, 30:11, 31:4, 50:5, 75:19</p> <p><b>heard</b> [4] - 23:23, 26:12, 35:6, 68:13</p> <p><b>hearing</b> [4] - 26:24, 49:5, 51:9, 60:19</p> <p><b>hell</b> [1] - 42:6</p> <p><b>help</b> [4] - 15:9, 27:11, 31:12, 61:22</p> <p><b>helpful</b> [3] - 4:19, 17:3, 71:3</p> <p><b>HENRY</b> [1] - 2:5</p> <p><b>Henry</b> [1] - 3:8</p> <p><b>hereby</b> [1] - 77:5</p> <p><b>high</b> [2] - 27:14, 34:12</p> <p><b>higher</b> [1] - 20:4</p> <p><b>highly</b> [1] - 26:1</p> <p><b>hit</b> [1] - 74:2</p> <p><b>hold</b> [7] - 33:20, 38:24, 39:13, 45:5, 55:1, 71:11</p> <p><b>Honor</b> [90] - 3:5, 3:12, 4:3, 4:12, 4:25, 5:11, 6:24, 7:7, 8:4, 9:2, 9:4, 10:5, 10:12, 11:8, 11:18, 11:22, 13:5, 13:6, 13:24, 15:19, 16:4, 16:8, 17:15, 17:20, 17:22, 18:14, 21:2, 23:11, 24:9, 24:15, 25:15, 25:22, 27:13, 31:25, 32:3, 35:1, 35:20, 36:2, 38:3, 42:16, 43:20, 44:1, 45:14, 46:21, 48:5, 48:19, 48:25, 49:10, 49:13, 49:16, 50:8, 50:22, 51:7, 51:21, 54:19, 55:14, 57:22, 58:9, 58:14, 58:22, 59:7, 59:10, 60:24, 61:13, 61:19, 61:25, 63:15, 64:1, 64:10, 65:18, 66:3, 67:9, 67:14, 67:24, 68:3, 68:10, 69:10, 70:1, 70:11,</p>
	<p><b>facts</b> [4] - 22:9, 55:6, 56:4, 56:6</p> <p><b>factual</b> [1] - 6:4</p> <p><b>factually</b> [1] - 55:19</p> <p><b>fail</b> [1] - 4:7</p> <p><b>failling</b> [1] - 26:3</p> <p><b>failure</b> [1] - 56:24</p> <p><b>fair</b> [2] - 42:4, 70:9</p> <p><b>fairly</b> [2] - 40:14, 41:12</p> <p><b>faith</b> [3] - 22:2, 22:5, 59:8</p> <p><b>fall</b> [1] - 54:13</p> <p><b>fallen</b> [1] - 42:12</p> <p><b>false</b> [3] - 54:7, 55:3, 56:20</p> <p><b>familiar</b> [1] - 73:12</p> <p><b>fashion</b> [5] - 29:2, 34:9, 34:19, 41:1, 41:24</p> <p><b>fault</b> [1] - 50:24</p> <p><b>fees</b> [1] - 45:18</p> <p><b>few</b> [1] - 64:14</p> <p><b>figure</b> [10] - 4:23, 5:3, 18:22, 44:21, 49:25, 51:20, 58:4, 60:2, 63:11, 68:6</p> <p><b>figures</b> [1] - 26:18</p> <p><b>file</b> [2] - 4:11, 43:8</p> <p><b>filed</b> [2] - 15:1, 68:11</p> <p><b>files</b> [1] - 74:2</p>	<p><b>form</b> [3] - 14:14, 14:17, 54:20</p> <p><b>formed</b> [1] - 23:3</p> <p><b>former</b> [1] - 69:3</p> <p><b>forms</b> [1] - 38:8</p> <p><b>forth</b> [2] - 23:12, 45:25</p> <p><b>forward</b> [1] - 28:19</p> <p><b>founders</b> [4] - 24:19, 25:1, 25:6, 25:25</p> <p><b>four</b> [3] - 20:21, 57:25, 65:6</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><b>four-day</b> [1] - 57:25</p> <p><b>frank</b> [3] - 20:8, 58:22, 59:24</p> <p><b>Friday</b> [6] - 18:12, 52:20, 52:22, 57:2, 72:18, 73:19</p> <p><b>front</b> [7] - 6:22, 7:6, 35:25, 36:2, 44:23, 49:13, 71:13</p> <p><b>frustrating</b> [1] - 55:9</p> <p><b>full</b> [1] - 16:12</p> <p><b>fully</b> [3] - 19:10, 19:15, 23:2</p>	<p><b>Haas</b> [1] - 44:4</p> <p><b>half</b> [2] - 20:21, 21:25</p> <p><b>hand</b> [1] - 32:20</p> <p><b>handful</b> [1] - 59:21</p> <p><b>hands</b> [13] - 16:8, 17:13, 50:15, 54:12, 54:22, 55:6, 55:8, 55:17, 55:21, 56:4, 56:13, 57:4</p> <p><b>happy</b> [4] - 4:18, 17:21, 17:25, 48:9</p> <p><b>harm</b> [25] - 27:21, 27:22, 27:25, 28:6, 28:24, 29:1, 29:12,</p>	

<p>70:21, 71:20, 72:11, 72:24, 74:25, 75:14, 75:15, 76:6, 76:22  <b>Honor's</b> [2] - 31:7, 51:23  <b>HONORABLE</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>Honorable</b> [1] - 3:1  <b>hope</b> [1] - 72:24  <b>horribles</b> [1] - 44:5  <b>host</b> [1] - 56:4  <b>hours</b> [3] - 48:7, 68:4, 73:16  <b>hurt</b> [1] - 39:5  <b>Huttinger</b> [1] - 3:8  <b>HUTTINGER</b> [3] - 2:5, 59:15, 59:21</p>	<p>8:18, 8:22, 23:20, 76:13  <b>including</b> [4] - 10:10, 25:7, 28:16, 45:22  <b>incorrect</b> [1] - 21:9  <b>indicated</b> [1] - 20:19  <b>industry's</b> [1] - 33:8  <b>inference</b> [1] - 41:12  <b>inflame</b> [1] - 25:8  <b>information</b> [5] - 10:1, 25:7, 27:18, 40:13, 72:5  <b>initial</b> [4] - 64:13, 64:16, 65:10, 66:13  <b>innovate</b> [1] - 22:25  <b>innovative</b> [1] - 23:6  <b>insisting</b> [1] - 41:22  <b>instead</b> [2] - 27:5, 29:11  <b>instructions</b> [1] - 73:14  <b>integrity</b> [1] - 23:15  <b>intellectual</b> [3] - 33:10, 34:7, 42:20  <b>intend</b> [13] - 6:11, 6:12, 6:13, 8:21, 21:12, 27:16, 28:2, 32:2, 34:21, 34:22, 60:11, 65:23, 69:4  <b>intended</b> [5] - 15:6, 23:13, 45:8, 60:6, 64:15  <b>intends</b> [1] - 41:18  <b>interaction</b> [1] - 22:11  <b>interest</b> [1] - 45:16  <b>interesting</b> [1] - 44:14  <b>interfered</b> [1] - 55:25  <b>internal</b> [1] - 56:2  <b>interrogatory</b> [6] - 64:17, 64:18, 64:20, 66:4, 66:17, 67:18  <b>intertwined</b> [1] - 16:22  <b>introduce</b> [1] - 11:3  <b>introducing</b> [1] - 25:7  <b>involve</b> [3] - 19:5, 19:6, 19:7  <b>involved</b> [2] - 19:25, 66:14  <b>involving</b> [3] - 20:24, 73:1, 73:2  <b>IP</b> [3] - 34:6, 41:1, 42:21  <b>irrelevant</b> [3] - 18:18, 20:16, 24:20  <b>ish</b> [1] - 31:5  <b>issue</b> [30] - 5:25, 10:19, 11:25, 12:15, 12:18, 14:13, 15:19, 17:16, 17:17, 19:23, 21:4, 23:4, 24:2,</p>	<p>24:21, 26:10, 31:25, 36:17, 39:18, 41:18, 44:3, 44:14, 50:18, 51:2, 60:8, 62:16, 64:9, 64:11, 65:3, 72:25, 76:18  <b>issues</b> [47] - 6:14, 7:1, 10:17, 15:2, 16:22, 18:1, 18:3, 18:4, 18:19, 22:10, 22:15, 25:9, 33:13, 46:16, 47:15, 47:19, 48:22, 49:2, 49:7, 49:9, 49:23, 50:6, 50:10, 50:19, 50:21, 52:23, 53:21, 53:25, 54:4, 55:17, 56:16, 57:8, 57:25, 70:18, 71:13, 71:14, 71:17, 73:11, 73:17, 74:21, 74:22, 75:9, 76:11, 76:13  <b>jury's</b> [2] - 12:25, 19:21</p>	<p><b>learned</b> [2] - 22:21, 36:19  <b>least</b> [2] - 14:11, 49:11  <b>leave</b> [1] - 36:8  <b>leaves</b> [3] - 31:19, 50:6, 50:21  <b>leaving</b> [1] - 69:14  <b>left</b> [7] - 6:1, 18:24, 31:22, 43:19, 43:25, 44:2, 44:17  <b>legal</b> [2] - 45:23, 70:17  <b>legally</b> [1] - 47:2  <b>length</b> [2] - 15:7, 71:11  <b>less</b> [1] - 29:10  <b>lessen</b> [1] - 59:1  <b>letter</b> [9] - 3:24, 5:6, 10:10, 10:20, 11:20, 11:23, 13:23, 14:20, 17:2  <b>letters</b> [2] - 50:14, 50:20  <b>level</b> [2] - 27:14, 34:12  <b>license</b> [19] - 11:24, 12:2, 12:3, 12:13, 15:3, 33:15, 34:23, 37:15, 38:6, 38:14, 38:22, 39:3, 43:7, 54:17, 56:1, 56:18, 56:19, 56:20  <b>licensed</b> [17] - 14:2, 14:24, 15:12, 15:13, 15:22, 16:3, 16:6, 17:6, 17:10, 19:7, 19:9, 33:15, 36:15, 37:3, 54:5, 55:2, 56:17  <b>licensee</b> [7] - 8:16, 8:18, 23:3, 23:4, 23:10, 23:15, 34:5  <b>licensees</b> [7] - 23:18, 29:19, 33:11, 33:12, 33:17, 34:7, 36:19  <b>licenses</b> [12] - 33:18, 37:6, 37:7, 37:14, 38:5, 38:10, 38:15, 38:16, 41:8, 41:10, 42:7  <b>licensing</b> [6] - 14:9, 28:25, 34:6, 37:22, 38:12, 41:23  <b>life</b> [1] - 67:10  <b>light</b> [2] - 12:24, 75:25  <b>likelihood</b> [1] - 24:22  <b>limine</b> [15] - 7:25, 8:2, 9:5, 10:8, 10:18, 16:25, 17:12, 18:15, 23:24, 24:11, 24:17, 26:20, 31:22, 47:16  <b>limited</b> [1] - 67:4</p>
<p><b>I</b></p> <p><b>idea</b> [3] - 49:19, 54:9, 57:23  <b>identification</b> [1] - 64:12  <b>identified</b> [6] - 66:4, 66:5, 66:9, 66:14, 76:14, 76:15  <b>identify</b> [1] - 57:15  <b>illustrative</b> [1] - 64:5  <b>immediately</b> [2] - 8:16, 22:22  <b>impact</b> [8] - 8:9, 17:9, 23:17, 37:21, 62:2, 63:19  <b>impacted</b> [2] - 31:16, 33:14  <b>impacts</b> [3] - 33:10, 33:25, 62:18  <b>impairment</b> [1] - 28:15  <b>implicate</b> [1] - 27:18  <b>imply</b> [1] - 21:13  <b>implying</b> [1] - 20:13  <b>importance</b> [1] - 11:25  <b>important</b> [14] - 23:15, 29:16, 34:5, 34:6, 34:20, 37:5, 37:17, 37:18, 60:19, 60:20, 60:21, 60:22, 61:8, 63:1  <b>importantly</b> [1] - 16:7  <b>impression</b> [1] - 44:5  <b>IN</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>INC</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>incidental</b> [4] - 30:17, 31:8, 45:17, 57:12  <b>include</b> [4] - 33:14, 60:11, 74:9, 74:13  <b>included</b> [4] - 58:16, 59:23, 64:13, 69:2  <b>includes</b> [5] - 8:15,</p>	<p><b>J</b></p> <p><b>JACK</b> [1] - 2:10  <b>jack</b> [1] - 3:14  <b>JACOB</b> [1] - 2:14  <b>Jacob</b> [2] - 3:16, 24:15  <b>January</b> [2] - 51:17, 51:24  <b>Jeff</b> [1] - 65:9  <b>JENNIFER</b> [1] - 2:11  <b>Jennifer</b> [2] - 3:17, 7:7  <b>JMOLs</b> [1] - 69:16  <b>joined</b> [1] - 3:7  <b>Jones</b> [11] - 64:12, 64:13, 64:19, 64:22, 65:1, 65:22, 65:24, 66:4, 67:13, 67:19, 67:25  <b>JTX</b> [2] - 74:1  <b>Judge</b> [2] - 1:18, 12:18  <b>judge</b> [1] - 71:16  <b>judgment</b> [9] - 4:8, 18:3, 32:6, 32:23, 45:16, 47:6, 47:14, 47:22, 56:18  <b>June</b> [1] - 35:18  <b>juror</b> [2] - 74:20, 75:8  <b>jurors</b> [2] - 73:15, 76:2  <b>jury</b> [55] - 5:24, 6:5, 6:11, 6:21, 7:6, 16:9, 16:12, 18:6, 21:18, 21:19, 24:23, 25:8, 30:2, 31:2, 35:25,</p>	<p><b>lack</b> [1] - 69:8  <b>laid</b> [1] - 25:2  <b>language</b> [3] - 12:13, 62:8, 76:4  <b>large</b> [2] - 20:22, 59:15  <b>largest</b> [1] - 22:12  <b>last</b> [9] - 3:24, 5:1, 6:9, 25:11, 26:24, 52:3, 52:16, 66:18, 76:6  <b>latter</b> [1] - 27:13  <b>Laura</b> [1] - 3:8  <b>LAURA</b> [1] - 2:6  <b>law</b> [7] - 12:8, 17:19, 26:7, 47:12, 64:23, 66:6, 70:23  <b>lawsuit</b> [12] - 10:14, 10:22, 10:25, 11:5, 13:20, 21:15, 22:6, 29:16, 40:24, 41:17, 41:22, 43:8  <b>lawyer</b> [1] - 76:7  <b>lawyers</b> [3] - 73:1, 76:10, 76:12</p>	<p><b>learned</b> [2] - 22:21, 36:19  <b>least</b> [2] - 14:11, 49:11  <b>leave</b> [1] - 36:8  <b>leaves</b> [3] - 31:19, 50:6, 50:21  <b>leaving</b> [1] - 69:14  <b>left</b> [7] - 6:1, 18:24, 31:22, 43:19, 43:25, 44:2, 44:17  <b>legal</b> [2] - 45:23, 70:17  <b>legally</b> [1] - 47:2  <b>length</b> [2] - 15:7, 71:11  <b>less</b> [1] - 29:10  <b>lessen</b> [1] - 59:1  <b>letter</b> [9] - 3:24, 5:6, 10:10, 10:20, 11:20, 11:23, 13:23, 14:20, 17:2  <b>letters</b> [2] - 50:14, 50:20  <b>level</b> [2] - 27:14, 34:12  <b>license</b> [19] - 11:24, 12:2, 12:3, 12:13, 15:3, 33:15, 34:23, 37:15, 38:6, 38:14, 38:22, 39:3, 43:7, 54:17, 56:1, 56:18, 56:19, 56:20  <b>licensed</b> [17] - 14:2, 14:24, 15:12, 15:13, 15:22, 16:3, 16:6, 17:6, 17:10, 19:7, 19:9, 33:15, 36:15, 37:3, 54:5, 55:2, 56:17  <b>licensee</b> [7] - 8:16, 8:18, 23:3, 23:4, 23:10, 23:15, 34:5  <b>licensees</b> [7] - 23:18, 29:19, 33:11, 33:12, 33:17, 34:7, 36:19  <b>licenses</b> [12] - 33:18, 37:6, 37:7, 37:14, 38:5, 38:10, 38:15, 38:16, 41:8, 41:10, 42:7  <b>licensing</b> [6] - 14:9, 28:25, 34:6, 37:22, 38:12, 41:23  <b>life</b> [1] - 67:10  <b>light</b> [2] - 12:24, 75:25  <b>likelihood</b> [1] - 24:22  <b>limine</b> [15] - 7:25, 8:2, 9:5, 10:8, 10:18, 16:25, 17:12, 18:15, 23:24, 24:11, 24:17, 26:20, 31:22, 47:16  <b>limited</b> [1] - 67:4</p>

<p>LIPIN [1] - 2:16</p> <p>list [13] - 21:14, 45:11, 46:21, 58:8, 59:16, 61:3, 64:16, 67:20, 69:3, 73:21, 75:21, 76:2, 76:9</p> <p>listed [3] - 33:3, 64:19, 76:7</p> <p>lists [2] - 58:11, 64:9</p> <p>literally [1] - 29:18</p> <p>litigated [2] - 15:2, 52:17</p> <p>litigating [1] - 39:17</p> <p>litigation [7] - 9:7, 9:11, 9:12, 9:17, 21:5, 42:23, 62:21</p> <p>live [4] - 60:18, 61:10, 69:20, 76:19</p> <p>LLP [2] - 2:2, 2:10</p> <p>long-standing [2] - 22:10, 23:14</p> <p>Longman [1] - 3:19</p> <p>look [8] - 15:10, 27:2, 33:2, 37:25, 45:23, 46:9, 60:8, 76:2</p> <p>looked [1] - 49:3</p> <p>looking [3] - 18:23, 59:25, 63:10</p> <p>loose [1] - 42:6</p> <p>lose [1] - 71:25</p> <p>loss [1] - 30:3</p> <p>lost [2] - 51:4, 55:15</p> <p>lower [1] - 24:7</p> <p>LTD [1] - 1:4</p> <p>lunches [2] - 75:8, 75:9</p>	<p>mean [9] - 4:21, 5:21, 10:25, 54:20, 58:16, 58:17, 63:9, 67:17, 72:8</p> <p>meaning [1] - 11:25</p> <p>means [5] - 4:24, 32:17, 41:6, 45:23, 71:25</p> <p>meant [1] - 63:12</p> <p>mechanically [1] - 4:17</p> <p>meet [7] - 48:13, 63:8, 63:16, 71:22, 71:24, 72:1</p> <p>memos [1] - 21:14</p> <p>mentioned [2] - 74:3, 74:4</p> <p>mentioning [2] - 10:23, 64:24</p> <p>merger [2] - 53:7, 56:8</p> <p>met [2] - 48:6, 48:14</p> <p>middle [1] - 69:25</p> <p>might [2] - 50:13, 54:8</p> <p>MIL [4] - 7:20, 7:22, 32:7, 32:9</p> <p>milestone [4] - 25:11, 25:18, 26:6</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>MILs [1] - 7:10</p> <p>mind [2] - 12:25, 19:21</p> <p>minute [1] - 52:16</p> <p>misleading [1] - 21:18</p> <p>misunderstanding [1] - 17:7</p> <p>model [9] - 35:10, 37:3, 37:7, 37:19, 41:9, 41:24, 42:7, 42:22</p> <p>moment [2] - 37:13, 68:18</p> <p>Monday [4] - 18:12, 57:6, 57:21, 65:6</p> <p>monetary [5] - 30:12, 45:18, 45:22, 45:24, 46:12</p> <p>money [10] - 5:24, 18:21, 20:10, 24:1, 25:13, 25:24, 26:8, 31:5, 35:7, 35:9</p> <p>money-ish [1] - 31:5</p> <p>month [1] - 66:20</p> <p>moot [2] - 6:20, 65:21</p> <p>moreover [1] - 12:8</p> <p>Morgan [1] - 3:18</p> <p>MORGAN [1] - 2:15</p> <p>morning [2] - 5:5, 74:4</p> <p>MORRIS [1] - 2:10</p> <p>Morris [3] - 3:14, 3:17,</p>	<p>7:7</p> <p>MORRISON [1] - 2:2</p> <p>Morrison [2] - 3:9, 48:15</p> <p>most [2] - 14:12, 14:25</p> <p>motion [21] - 6:20, 7:25, 8:2, 9:5, 10:8, 10:18, 16:25, 17:12, 18:15, 23:24, 24:11, 24:17, 26:15, 26:20, 31:21, 31:22, 43:19, 43:21, 43:25, 47:24, 52:9</p> <p>motions [6] - 5:13, 5:14, 47:16, 47:20, 52:7</p> <p>motivation [9] - 16:20, 20:5, 20:17, 26:1, 26:9, 35:2, 35:3, 35:4, 35:6</p> <p>motive [6] - 12:19, 18:20, 26:17, 26:19, 41:17</p> <p>motives [1] - 12:9</p> <p>moved [3] - 18:2, 61:3, 61:4</p> <p>MR [43] - 3:12, 3:14, 6:8, 6:24, 8:2, 10:12, 10:17, 11:2, 11:22, 13:5, 19:1, 19:4, 24:12, 24:15, 25:14, 31:24, 32:12, 32:20, 35:1, 35:11, 36:16, 38:2, 44:1, 44:12, 44:22, 44:25, 45:3, 45:7, 45:10, 45:14, 46:18, 48:5, 48:14, 59:15, 59:21, 64:10, 65:16, 65:18, 65:20, 67:17, 67:24, 72:24, 73:10</p> <p>MS [139] - 3:5, 4:3, 4:11, 4:15, 4:20, 4:25, 5:8, 5:10, 7:7, 7:19, 9:2, 9:4, 10:5, 11:8, 11:12, 11:18, 13:6, 13:19, 15:15, 15:19, 16:4, 16:11, 16:17, 17:8, 17:15, 17:25, 18:2, 18:7, 18:13, 18:14, 21:2, 24:9, 25:22, 26:14, 27:12, 28:2, 28:13, 28:24, 29:15, 30:16, 30:21, 31:6, 31:11, 33:24, 34:3, 35:20, 35:22, 35:24, 37:9, 38:21, 39:7, 39:9, 39:14, 39:17, 40:2,</p>	<p>40:23, 41:16, 42:16, 43:4, 43:20, 46:21, 47:10, 48:19, 48:25, 49:6, 49:10, 49:16, 50:8, 50:22, 51:7, 51:11, 51:21, 52:8, 52:11, 52:25, 53:5, 53:9, 53:14, 53:17, 53:23, 54:19, 55:4, 55:14, 55:16, 55:19, 55:22, 56:17, 56:22, 57:9, 57:19, 57:22, 58:9, 58:22, 59:3, 59:7, 59:24, 60:14, 60:24, 61:13, 61:19, 61:25, 62:23, 62:25, 63:7, 63:15, 63:25, 64:3, 64:7, 66:3, 66:19, 66:25, 67:3, 67:14, 68:3, 68:7, 68:10, 68:15, 69:2, 69:10, 70:1, 70:5, 70:10, 70:11, 70:15, 70:21, 71:1, 71:6, 71:18, 71:20, 72:11, 73:8, 74:25, 75:10, 75:14, 75:15, 75:24, 76:3, 76:21, 76:24</p> <p>Muino [1] - 3:8</p> <p>MUINO [1] - 2:4</p> <p>multiple [3] - 13:15, 14:5, 33:5</p> <p>must [2] - 44:20, 72:2</p>	<p>negative [1] - 28:19</p> <p>negotiate [5] - 28:11, 28:15, 29:8, 43:8, 55:24</p> <p>negotiations [3] - 31:15, 33:13, 56:3</p> <p>neighborhood [1] - 19:4</p> <p>never [6] - 44:18, 45:19, 64:13, 65:5, 65:17</p> <p>new [3] - 14:20, 51:5, 61:15</p> <p>news [1] - 14:21</p> <p>next [1] - 52:11</p> <p>NICHOLAS [1] - 2:5</p> <p>nicholas [1] - 64:10</p> <p>Nicholas [1] - 3:8</p> <p>Nichols [3] - 3:15, 3:17, 7:8</p> <p>NICHOLS [1] - 2:10</p> <p>Nick [3] - 64:12, 64:13, 66:3</p> <p>night [2] - 3:25, 52:18</p> <p>nobody [4] - 13:18, 49:19, 52:13, 76:17</p> <p>none [4] - 19:6, 19:7, 19:12, 20:25</p> <p>nonparties [1] - 25:6</p> <p>noon [2] - 73:16, 73:19</p> <p>NOREIKA [1] - 1:18</p> <p>Noreika [1] - 3:1</p> <p>normal [1] - 75:20</p> <p>normally [1] - 50:5</p> <p>notebooks [1] - 74:20</p> <p>notes [2] - 66:10, 77:5</p> <p>nothing [2] - 19:25, 21:7</p> <p>notice [3] - 64:21, 64:25, 75:21</p> <p>notices [1] - 12:4</p> <p>notwithstanding [1] - 26:3</p> <p>November [5] - 1:12, 14:4, 48:6, 48:9, 66:6</p> <p>number [18] - 7:20, 7:22, 8:2, 9:5, 10:9, 16:22, 17:12, 18:15, 20:12, 23:24, 24:11, 26:20, 27:15, 45:1, 46:11, 62:6, 62:21, 74:8</p> <p>numbers [2] - 59:17, 74:1</p> <p>numerous [1] - 15:6</p> <p>NuVia [44] - 3:15, 8:11, 8:16, 9:9, 9:14, 9:17, 9:19, 9:20,</p>
<b>M</b>				

9:23, 9:24, 10:2, 15:4, 15:14, 15:15, 15:23, 20:4, 20:18, 20:20, 22:24, 23:6, 24:6, 24:19, 24:20, 25:6, 26:5, 26:19, 32:18, 37:11, 38:6, 52:25, 53:1, 53:6, 53:14, 54:2, 54:21, 56:10, 56:24, 62:6, 62:14, 62:22, 63:4, 69:3, 69:22 <b>NYARADY</b> [33] - 13:6, 13:19, 15:15, 15:19, 16:4, 16:11, 16:17, 17:8, 21:2, 24:9, 60:24, 61:13, 61:19, 61:25, 62:23, 63:15, 66:3, 66:19, 66:25, 67:3, 67:14, 68:3, 68:7, 68:10, 69:10, 70:1, 70:5, 70:11, 71:20, 75:15, 75:24, 76:21, 76:24 <b>Nyarady</b> [1] - 13:7 <b>NYARDY</b> [2] - 2:14, 7:6 <b>Nyrady</b> [3] - 3:16, 24:11, 42:8	13:7, 21:7, 23:2, 35:3 <b>ominous</b> [1] - 72:21 <b>once</b> [4] - 58:4, 68:25, 69:12, 70:2 <b>one</b> [31] - 6:14, 7:24, 10:11, 13:2, 15:2, 16:15, 17:1, 25:9, 29:5, 29:6, 29:18, 32:20, 34:4, 38:20, 40:18, 41:7, 41:8, 47:17, 54:8, 58:1, 63:25, 64:9, 65:2, 67:8, 67:17, 68:16, 68:22, 73:3, 74:12, 74:18 <b>ones</b> [1] - 5:14 <b>ongoing</b> [1] - 22:14 <b>open</b> [2] - 44:17, 69:14 <b>opened</b> [1] - 11:16 <b>opening</b> [1] - 25:16 <b>opinion</b> [2] - 5:16, 12:17 <b>opportunity</b> [2] - 6:8, 73:5 <b>oppose</b> [1] - 65:12 <b>opposing</b> [1] - 69:21 <b>opposition</b> [1] - 73:6 <b>options</b> [1] - 51:15 <b>order</b> [31] - 5:13, 14:25, 15:5, 17:16, 23:12, 26:5, 30:20, 30:22, 44:23, 45:1, 45:15, 47:15, 47:17, 50:2, 55:12, 58:17, 58:19, 60:8, 60:10, 60:13, 60:15, 61:2, 61:7, 61:15, 61:17, 62:3, 65:16, 68:11, 70:13, 74:2 <b>ordered</b> [2] - 48:2, 48:10 <b>orderly</b> [1] - 69:17 <b>organized</b> [1] - 74:8 <b>original</b> [1] - 15:14 <b>originally</b> [2] - 55:1, 60:23 <b>otherwise</b> [3] - 48:11, 66:8, 74:7 <b>ought</b> [2] - 50:4, 66:21 <b>OUT</b> [1] - 76:4 <b>outside</b> [2] - 31:21, 48:16 <b>outstanding</b> [2] - 20:9, 58:23 <b>outweighed</b> [1] - 24:22 <b>own</b> [2] - 14:7, 63:14	<b>P</b> <b>p.m</b> [2] - 1:13, 77:3 <b>page</b> [6] - 45:4, 45:10, 45:13, 45:14, 60:12, 60:17 <b>pages</b> [8] - 17:23, 17:24, 18:10, 25:16, 52:20, 57:3, 57:18, 75:22 <b>paid</b> [7] - 18:17, 19:2, 19:24, 24:1, 25:12, 32:18, 32:19 <b>Palo</b> [1] - 48:14 <b>paper</b> [4] - 37:8, 42:7, 60:3, 74:17 <b>papers</b> [5] - 10:13, 11:15, 13:8, 70:25, 71:10 <b>parade</b> [1] - 44:5 <b>paragraph</b> [29] - 7:12, 7:14, 13:16, 14:6, 15:1, 23:13, 23:17, 23:18, 33:4, 33:7, 35:14, 35:21, 35:22, 36:12, 36:13, 45:4, 45:9, 45:11, 48:1, 48:22, 49:2, 61:6, 61:21, 63:24, 64:8, 68:8, 68:18, 72:20 <b>paragraphs</b> [4] - 7:9, 7:25, 15:6, 15:8 <b>part</b> [19] - 10:18, 15:25, 16:5, 16:20, 18:12, 18:21, 23:15, 23:25, 25:3, 26:17, 27:21, 30:7, 32:21, 32:23, 50:23, 59:15, 69:18, 73:5 <b>participate</b> [1] - 63:7 <b>particular</b> [1] - 25:10 <b>parties</b> [31] - 7:10, 7:12, 7:14, 8:4, 8:12, 9:7, 12:6, 15:16, 16:25, 18:9, 22:1, 22:8, 22:14, 37:12, 37:14, 48:15, 49:11, 50:8, 50:24, 58:9, 58:23, 59:9, 59:25, 61:1, 61:10, 63:21, 68:19, 72:13, 72:17, 73:20, 74:4 <b>parties'</b> [1] - 8:14 <b>partner</b> [1] - 20:11 <b>partners</b> [1] - 36:18 <b>parts</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>party</b> [8] - 10:9, 16:1, 26:8, 26:23, 62:4, 62:11, 69:12 <b>party's</b> [1] - 69:21	<b>past</b> [3] - 28:14, 31:15, 35:17 <b>patent</b> [1] - 74:23 <b>patience</b> [1] - 5:19 <b>Patterson</b> [1] - 3:18 <b>PATTERSON</b> [1] - 2:16 <b>Paul</b> [3] - 3:16, 3:18, 72:25 <b>PAUL</b> [1] - 2:13 <b>pause</b> [1] - 59:14 <b>pay</b> [4] - 19:14, 21:15, 22:6, 45:15 <b>paying</b> [4] - 19:19, 20:10, 29:10, 40:5 <b>payment</b> [2] - 25:11, 25:18 <b>payments</b> [9] - 21:5, 21:8, 21:20, 21:21, 21:24, 22:3, 22:13, 25:19, 26:6 <b>pending</b> [3] - 25:11, 47:19, 47:20 <b>people</b> [17] - 6:4, 27:6, 29:9, 35:18, 36:5, 37:6, 37:18, 37:19, 38:15, 41:6, 41:9, 42:6, 60:9, 61:5, 75:23 <b>people's</b> [1] - 38:14 <b>perception</b> [2] - 33:9, 37:11 <b>perform</b> [1] - 56:24 <b>performance</b> [16] - 6:17, 8:4, 8:8, 8:25, 13:1, 22:3, 22:14, 27:23, 30:14, 30:18, 31:9, 36:1, 50:12, 50:18, 57:11, 58:3 <b>perhaps</b> [2] - 61:5, 68:14 <b>permission</b> [1] - 24:12 <b>permit</b> [1] - 69:6 <b>permitted</b> [2] - 26:16, 28:18 <b>person</b> [3] - 5:19, 28:10, 66:8 <b>personally</b> [3] - 9:15, 9:22, 63:7 <b>phase</b> [4] - 27:22, 35:25, 36:10, 50:11 <b>pick</b> [1] - 71:17 <b>piece</b> [1] - 13:21 <b>piecemeal</b> [2] - 51:13, 59:13 <b>place</b> [3] - 66:20, 73:12, 74:18 <b>places</b> [2] - 45:1, 61:18 <b>Plaintiff</b> [2] - 1:6, 2:7
<b>O</b> <b>object</b> [2] - 64:11, 67:10 <b>objected</b> [3] - 32:23, 65:3, 69:6 <b>objecting</b> [1] - 44:8 <b>objection</b> [5] - 50:23, 68:13, 68:14, 69:7, 73:8 <b>obligation</b> [1] - 66:11 <b>obligations</b> [1] - 26:2 <b>obtained</b> [1] - 23:10 <b>obviously</b> [4] - 15:15, 27:21, 35:25, 56:25 <b>occurred</b> [1] - 12:10 <b>October</b> [6] - 10:10, 10:20, 11:19, 13:23, 14:20, 17:1 <b>OF</b> [1] - 1:2 <b>offered</b> [1] - 7:2 <b>office</b> [1] - 48:15 <b>Official</b> [1] - 77:7 <b>older</b> [1] - 19:9 <b>OLSON</b> [13] - 2:3, 6:8, 6:24, 8:2, 10:12, 10:17, 11:2, 11:22, 13:5, 19:1, 19:4, 48:5, 48:14 <b>Olson</b> [6] - 3:7, 7:20,	<b>part</b> [19] - 10:18, 15:25, 16:5, 16:20, 18:12, 18:21, 23:15, 23:25, 25:3, 26:17, 27:21, 30:7, 32:21, 32:23, 50:23, 59:15, 69:18, 73:5 <b>participate</b> [1] - 63:7 <b>particular</b> [1] - 25:10 <b>parties</b> [31] - 7:10, 7:12, 7:14, 8:4, 8:12, 9:7, 12:6, 15:16, 16:25, 18:9, 22:1, 22:8, 22:14, 37:12, 37:14, 48:15, 49:11, 50:8, 50:24, 58:9, 58:23, 59:9, 59:25, 61:1, 61:10, 63:21, 68:19, 72:13, 72:17, 73:20, 74:4 <b>parties'</b> [1] - 8:14 <b>partner</b> [1] - 20:11 <b>partners</b> [1] - 36:18 <b>parts</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>party</b> [8] - 10:9, 16:1, 26:8, 26:23, 62:4, 62:11, 69:12 <b>party's</b> [1] - 69:21	<b>part</b> [19] - 10:18, 15:25, 16:5, 16:20, 18:12, 18:21, 23:15, 23:25, 25:3, 26:17, 27:21, 30:7, 32:21, 32:23, 50:23, 59:15, 69:18, 73:5 <b>participate</b> [1] - 63:7 <b>particular</b> [1] - 25:10 <b>parties</b> [31] - 7:10, 7:12, 7:14, 8:4, 8:12, 9:7, 12:6, 15:16, 16:25, 18:9, 22:1, 22:8, 22:14, 37:12, 37:14, 48:15, 49:11, 50:8, 50:24, 58:9, 58:23, 59:9, 59:25, 61:1, 61:10, 63:21, 68:19, 72:13, 72:17, 73:20, 74:4 <b>parties'</b> [1] - 8:14 <b>partner</b> [1] - 20:11 <b>partners</b> [1] - 36:18 <b>parts</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>party</b> [8] - 10:9, 16:1, 26:8, 26:23, 62:4, 62:11, 69:12 <b>party's</b> [1] - 69:21	<b>part</b> [19] - 10:18, 15:25, 16:5, 16:20, 18:12, 18:21, 23:15, 23:25, 25:3, 26:17, 27:21, 30:7, 32:21, 32:23, 50:23, 59:15, 69:18, 73:5 <b>participate</b> [1] - 63:7 <b>particular</b> [1] - 25:10 <b>parties</b> [31] - 7:10, 7:12, 7:14, 8:4, 8:12, 9:7, 12:6, 15:16, 16:25, 18:9, 22:1, 22:8, 22:14, 37:12, 37:14, 48:15, 49:11, 50:8, 50:24, 58:9, 58:23, 59:9, 59:25, 61:1, 61:10, 63:21, 68:19, 72:13, 72:17, 73:20, 74:4 <b>parties'</b> [1] - 8:14 <b>partner</b> [1] - 20:11 <b>partners</b> [1] - 36:18 <b>parts</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>party</b> [8] - 10:9, 16:1, 26:8, 26:23, 62:4, 62:11, 69:12 <b>party's</b> [1] - 69:21

<p>17:21  <b>preceding</b> [1] - 56:10  <b>preclude</b> [2] - 26:21, 43:22  <b>precluded</b> [1] - 65:1  <b>precludes</b> [1] - 17:5  <b>precluding</b> [1] - 44:8  <b>predicate</b> [1] - 29:21  <b>prejudice</b> [4] - 4:7, 12:24, 19:20, 24:22  <b>prejudicial</b> [4] - 17:3, 20:9, 20:10, 20:16  <b>preliminary</b> [1] - 73:14  <b>prepared</b> [1] - 17:15  <b>present</b> [6] - 8:7, 8:10, 48:16, 49:13, 65:23, 70:7  <b>presentation</b> [1] - 69:21  <b>presented</b> [1] - 69:20  <b>preserving</b> [1] - 63:20  <b>president</b> [2] - 33:3, 69:4  <b>presiding</b> [1] - 3:1  <b>presumably</b> [1] - 46:9  <b>pretend</b> [1] - 31:4  <b>pretrial</b> [29] - 14:25, 15:5, 16:14, 17:16, 23:12, 30:19, 30:22, 44:22, 44:25, 45:1, 47:15, 55:9, 55:12, 58:17, 58:19, 60:8, 60:10, 60:13, 60:15, 61:2, 61:7, 61:15, 61:17, 62:3, 65:16, 67:16, 68:11, 72:20, 72:21  <b>Pretrial</b> [1] - 1:13  <b>pretty</b> [1] - 39:5  <b>prevent</b> [1] - 11:21  <b>previously</b> [3] - 48:10, 74:3  <b>price</b> [1] - 24:25  <b>prices</b> [1] - 28:11  <b>probative</b> [1] - 11:23  <b>problem</b> [9] - 4:5, 36:13, 38:2, 42:2, 42:13, 42:17, 43:9, 60:7, 62:24  <b>problems</b> [1] - 40:9  <b>proceeding</b> [1] - 77:5  <b>proceedings</b> [1] - 32:23  <b>proceeds</b> [2] - 24:19, 25:5  <b>process</b> [1] - 72:22  <b>produce</b> [5] - 27:3, 40:13, 40:18, 42:15  <b>produced</b> [8] - 9:16, 27:10, 28:12, 36:6,</p>	<p>62:3, 62:5, 62:20, 63:1  <b>produces</b> [1] - 26:22  <b>product</b> [3] - 13:14, 26:5, 43:23  <b>Products</b> [1] - 12:17  <b>products</b> [27] - 13:10, 14:9, 14:16, 14:24, 15:21, 16:7, 17:6, 17:9, 19:6, 19:9, 19:12, 20:24, 21:8, 21:9, 21:15, 21:22, 22:4, 22:6, 22:25, 23:2, 23:7, 23:21, 24:2, 33:14  <b>proffer</b> [1] - 44:10  <b>program</b> [5] - 26:22, 27:14, 38:12, 43:23, 43:25  <b>promised</b> [2] - 26:7, 71:4  <b>proof</b> [1] - 45:8  <b>proofs</b> [2] - 15:6, 23:13  <b>properly</b> [1] - 57:16  <b>property</b> [3] - 33:10, 34:7, 42:20  <b>proposal</b> [7] - 7:13, 7:15, 51:19, 51:21, 52:18, 61:23, 67:25  <b>proposals</b> [2] - 33:12, 63:22  <b>propose</b> [2] - 68:4, 69:14  <b>proposed</b> [2] - 14:17, 69:10  <b>proposition</b> [1] - 64:23  <b>protect</b> [2] - 33:9, 42:20  <b>prove</b> [1] - 70:24  <b>proved</b> [2] - 54:4, 54:6  <b>proven</b> [1] - 54:23  <b>provide</b> [8] - 14:9, 48:9, 64:21, 64:25, 72:13, 73:20, 75:9, 76:1  <b>provided</b> [3] - 8:22, 23:2, 74:12  <b>provides</b> [4] - 12:23, 15:3, 25:4, 25:16  <b>provision</b> [3] - 8:13, 10:2, 54:1  <b>PTO</b> [7] - 7:9, 7:11, 7:14, 52:2, 58:10, 58:14, 60:5  <b>PTX</b> [2] - 74:1  <b>public</b> [1] - 72:14  <b>pull</b> [2] - 44:24, 74:18  <b>purpose</b> [5] - 6:12,</p>	<p>56:4, 62:9, 63:5, 67:4  <b>purposes</b> [4] - 28:25, 30:5, 40:3, 40:6  <b>pursuing</b> [1] - 42:23  <b>put</b> [30] - 4:7, 7:11, 7:21, 13:11, 19:11, 19:13, 19:15, 21:16, 27:16, 28:20, 29:7, 31:13, 31:17, 32:6, 32:21, 35:19, 36:9, 36:17, 41:18, 44:19, 45:25, 46:5, 46:7, 47:10, 52:2, 52:16, 60:22, 67:9, 69:19, 70:2  <b>putting</b> [1] - 44:3</p>	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p><b>QUALCOMM</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>Qualcomm</b> [94] - 3:15, 3:19, 8:12, 10:10, 11:21, 12:3, 13:7, 13:9, 13:11, 13:13, 13:18, 13:22, 14:3, 14:6, 14:8, 14:13, 14:15, 14:16, 14:19, 14:20, 15:7, 15:14, 15:15, 15:20, 15:22, 15:23, 16:5, 16:6, 16:21, 17:1, 18:18, 19:2, 19:7, 19:10, 19:11, 20:4, 20:21, 21:16, 22:1, 22:4, 22:12, 22:15, 22:24, 23:6, 23:21, 24:6, 24:10, 26:6, 27:23, 28:4, 28:17, 29:9, 32:18, 34:8, 34:12, 34:15, 34:18, 34:19, 37:11, 39:11, 39:15, 41:1, 41:18, 41:19, 42:10, 42:25, 48:6, 53:1, 53:11, 53:14, 54:2, 54:6, 54:21, 54:23, 55:2, 56:8, 56:10, 62:5, 62:7, 62:14, 62:20, 62:21, 63:1, 63:3, 64:15, 64:17, 65:3, 65:10, 65:22, 69:4, 69:6  <b>Qualcomm's</b> [11] - 13:10, 15:3, 24:11, 26:18, 26:20, 28:17, 36:14, 53:1, 54:5, 64:12, 64:13  <b>questions</b> [1] - 49:4  <b>quite</b> [5] - 26:7, 36:23, 65:5, 76:2, 76:9</p>	<p><b>R</b></p> <p><b>Racing</b> [1] - 12:17  <b>raise</b> [4] - 6:22, 46:19, 51:4, 55:12  <b>raised</b> [7] - 14:23, 21:18, 25:9, 30:1, 32:1, 38:3, 55:11  <b>raising</b> [2] - 44:9, 51:4  <b>ranges</b> [1] - 60:2  <b>rate</b> [2] - 24:7, 26:17  <b>rates</b> [6] - 20:3, 20:7, 22:25, 24:4, 28:16, 55:24  <b>rather</b> [1] - 71:3  <b>ratings</b> [1] - 23:8  <b>re</b> [1] - 6:22  <b>re-raise</b> [1] - 6:22  <b>reached</b> [3] - 7:10, 7:21, 7:23  <b>read</b> [3] - 5:18, 32:7, 71:4  <b>reading</b> [2] - 5:6, 8:6  <b>ready</b> [1] - 3:23  <b>real</b> [1] - 38:17  <b>realized</b> [1] - 60:3  <b>really</b> [9] - 21:24, 55:9, 59:19, 61:10, 61:23, 62:15, 68:9, 75:22, 75:23  <b>reason</b> [10] - 5:6, 11:16, 27:20, 34:16, 34:18, 41:3, 41:21, 46:14, 54:8, 72:1  <b>reasons</b> [5] - 12:14, 25:4, 33:1, 34:4, 34:14  <b>receive</b> [1] - 24:7  <b>received</b> [3] - 3:24, 24:19, 25:1  <b>recent</b> [1] - 14:12  <b>recently</b> [1] - 14:25  <b>record</b> [10] - 5:1, 7:11, 7:22, 21:6, 23:22, 47:11, 58:20, 62:10, 62:19, 62:21  <b>records</b> [5] - 62:4, 62:7, 62:15, 63:21  <b>redacted</b> [3] - 27:18, 38:8, 38:11  <b>redactions</b> [1] - 26:23  <b>refer</b> [4] - 9:21, 10:14, 10:24, 11:5  <b>reference</b> [6] - 9:9, 9:11, 14:10, 15:8, 20:22, 72:12  <b>referenced</b> [1] - 22:11  <b>references</b> [2] - 14:11, 23:22  <b>referring</b> [1] - 10:22</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>68:9, 68:19  <b>representatives</b> [2] - 68:12, 68:22  <b>represented</b> [1] - 9:13  <b>reputation</b> [2] - 30:4, 33:9  <b>reputational</b> [2] - 6:1, 47:7  <b>request</b> [9] - 8:12, 20:5, 30:13, 30:17, 46:14, 56:19, 57:11, 57:12, 72:3  <b>requested</b> [4] - 8:7, 8:9, 46:10, 65:12  <b>requests</b> [1] - 8:14  <b>require</b> [1] - 36:10  <b>requirement</b> [1] - 26:3  <b>requirements</b> [1] - 62:11  <b>requires</b> [1] - 50:19  <b>requiring</b> [1] - 45:15  <b>reserve</b> [1] - 65:8  <b>reserves</b> [1] - 9:21  <b>resolve</b> [3] - 4:2, 21:17, 69:18  <b>resolved</b> [5] - 7:9, 10:18, 47:22, 63:25, 68:14  <b>respect</b> [27] - 5:17, 9:4, 11:15, 13:10, 13:19, 20:5, 21:21, 21:23, 34:7, 37:6, 37:7, 37:18, 37:19, 41:7, 41:9, 42:6, 43:7, 46:24, 54:3, 55:16, 60:25, 66:3, 68:12, 70:5, 70:16, 73:13, 75:20  <b>respected</b> [1] - 37:15  <b>respectful</b> [1] - 63:14  <b>respecting</b> [4] - 37:14, 37:20, 41:10, 42:11  <b>respond</b> [7] - 17:24, 18:12, 35:2, 35:8, 44:13, 57:6, 57:20  <b>response</b> [17] - 8:20, 14:1, 14:18, 14:23, 15:21, 25:4, 25:10, 32:7, 34:16, 41:16, 64:18, 64:20, 64:24, 66:5, 66:15, 66:17  <b>responses</b> [1] - 67:18  <b>responsive</b> [1] - 6:15  <b>rest</b> [1] - 43:18  <b>result</b> [2] - 12:5, 14:1  <b>return</b> [1] - 8:18  <b>review</b> [1] - 75:4  <b>revised</b> [1] - 58:15  <b>rid</b> [2] - 34:15, 34:17  <b>rights</b> [2] - 41:22,</p>	<p>42:19  <b>rise</b> [3] - 2:24, 34:24, 77:1  <b>ROBERT</b> [1] - 1:23  <b>rog</b> [2] - 64:24, 66:15  <b>roles</b> [1] - 33:8  <b>rolled</b> [1] - 56:3  <b>room</b> [1] - 52:13  <b>royalties</b> [12] - 18:17, 18:18, 18:23, 19:1, 19:20, 19:24, 32:12, 32:17, 32:18, 38:13, 45:15, 48:24  <b>royalty</b> [10] - 18:19, 19:14, 20:3, 21:10, 21:14, 22:20, 24:4, 24:7, 26:17, 55:24  <b>RUBY</b> [1] - 2:15  <b>Ruby</b> [1] - 3:19  <b>Rule</b> [4] - 65:19, 65:20, 67:2, 67:3  <b>rule</b> [1] - 43:15  <b>rules</b> [2] - 66:7, 69:5  <b>ruling</b> [4] - 17:5, 17:7, 17:8, 17:12  <b>run</b> [1] - 4:5</p>	<p>10:14, 13:20, 13:21, 42:9, 44:24  <b>secret</b> [1] - 55:13  <b>Section</b> [4] - 8:11, 8:15, 9:20, 10:15  <b>see</b> [5] - 35:8, 43:16, 46:10, 58:4, 75:21  <b>seek</b> [5] - 24:17, 25:8, 26:21, 43:22, 45:21  <b>seeking</b> [2] - 24:24, 45:11  <b>seeks</b> [3] - 18:16, 54:24, 54:25  <b>seem</b> [2] - 29:12, 30:12  <b>select</b> [1] - 73:17  <b>selection</b> [2] - 71:14, 73:11  <b>sell</b> [1] - 19:13  <b>selling</b> [1] - 15:20  <b>send</b> [4] - 57:17, 74:4, 74:14, 74:15  <b>senior</b> [2] - 33:3, 69:4  <b>sense</b> [3] - 11:17, 14:21, 49:11  <b>sent</b> [1] - 60:4  <b>separate</b> [6] - 11:3, 15:13, 15:16, 36:1, 36:2, 57:1  <b>separately</b> [1] - 20:2  <b>series</b> [3] - 8:17, 8:19, 19:8  <b>serve</b> [1] - 62:9  <b>session</b> [1] - 3:1  <b>set</b> [5] - 23:12, 49:12, 51:9, 72:17, 74:20  <b>settlement</b> [1] - 48:1  <b>seven</b> [1] - 64:19  <b>Seventh</b> [1] - 12:16  <b>severe</b> [1] - 34:10  <b>severely</b> [1] - 20:10  <b>SHAELYN</b> [1] - 2:4  <b>Shaelyn</b> [1] - 3:7  <b>shall</b> [1] - 8:18  <b>SHEA</b> [1] - 1:23  <b>sheet</b> [1] - 25:3  <b>shop</b> [1] - 41:23  <b>short</b> [3] - 49:6, 67:11, 73:5  <b>shortly</b> [1] - 5:16  <b>show</b> [14] - 17:2, 18:20, 21:14, 22:4, 22:8, 26:17, 26:19, 27:21, 27:24, 30:5, 40:5, 70:25, 71:4  <b>showing</b> [5] - 22:21, 28:21, 28:22, 28:23, 28:25  <b>shown</b> [2] - 20:17, 72:9</p>	<p><b>shows</b> [1] - 26:9  <b>side</b> [5] - 4:14, 4:15, 51:25, 69:13, 74:15  <b>side's</b> [1] - 72:5  <b>sidelines</b> [2] - 42:19, 42:24  <b>sides</b> [2] - 22:11, 58:11  <b>signed</b> [1] - 25:3  <b>silly</b> [1] - 63:9  <b>similar</b> [1] - 5:3  <b>similarly</b> [1] - 56:6  <b>simplification</b> [1] - 6:9  <b>simplifying</b> [1] - 3:25  <b>simply</b> [1] - 64:24  <b>single</b> [1] - 73:21  <b>sit</b> [2] - 68:19, 71:9  <b>sitting</b> [1] - 42:23  <b>six</b> [2] - 14:11, 65:8  <b>sky</b> [1] - 42:12  <b>slow</b> [1] - 56:3  <b>Smith</b> [1] - 76:16  <b>solve</b> [1] - 42:17  <b>someone</b> [3] - 18:22, 28:9, 29:7  <b>sometimes</b> [1] - 76:15  <b>soon</b> [1] - 47:21  <b>sorry</b> [6] - 21:13, 23:4, 45:13, 45:14, 56:23, 75:3  <b>sort</b> [4] - 30:1, 35:8, 52:16, 60:5  <b>sought</b> [3] - 8:23, 14:15, 53:25  <b>sound</b> [2] - 32:13, 43:14  <b>sounds</b> [7] - 31:4, 32:14, 37:25, 43:12, 71:6, 72:21, 73:9  <b>speaking</b> [2] - 12:18, 76:19  <b>speaks</b> [1] - 12:15  <b>specific</b> [26] - 6:17, 8:3, 8:8, 8:25, 13:1, 19:18, 24:18, 26:10, 27:17, 27:23, 28:15, 29:23, 30:14, 30:18, 31:9, 34:23, 35:13, 35:25, 38:20, 43:24, 50:12, 50:18, 57:11, 58:3  <b>specifically</b> [4] - 28:8, 32:8, 66:7, 66:10  <b>speculative</b> [7] - 28:22, 29:13, 31:17, 32:24, 37:17, 39:23, 40:19  <b>speed</b> [1] - 26:5  <b>spend</b> [3] - 34:11, 63:10, 63:11</p>
---	---	---	--

<b>substantial</b> [1] - 59:18 <b>substantially</b> [1] - 24:22 <b>sue</b> [2] - 29:18, 35:6 <b>suffered</b> [1] - 47:5 <b>suffering</b> [1] - 36:5 <b>suffice</b> [1] - 47:2 <b>suffices</b> [1] - 40:5 <b>sufficient</b> [5] - 20:22, 30:5, 47:2, 64:21, 66:7 <b>sufficiently</b> [1] - 20:17 <b>suggest</b> [5] - 4:21, 28:9, 32:16, 34:13, 60:14 <b>suggested</b> [1] - 58:7 <b>suggesting</b> [1] - 20:13 <b>suggestion</b> [1] - 60:13 <b>suggests</b> [1] - 58:25 <b>suing</b> [3] - 35:7, 35:9 <b>suit</b> [1] - 35:3 <b>summary</b> [5] - 32:5, 32:23, 47:5, 47:13, 47:22 <b>super</b> [1] - 39:22 <b>supplement</b> [2] - 66:8, 66:11 <b>supplemental</b> [3] - 45:17, 59:22, 64:18 <b>support</b> [2] - 56:5, 56:6 <b>supporting</b> [1] - 64:23 <b>suppose</b> [1] - 41:11 <b>supposed</b> [7] - 16:1, 33:16, 43:2, 49:19, 49:20, 53:13, 59:13 <b>Supreme</b> [1] - 17:20 <b>Suzuki</b> [1] - 12:17 <b>swapped</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>swing</b> [1] - 31:25	<b>terminated</b> [1] - 56:12 <b>termination</b> [8] - 9:14, 9:17, 9:19, 10:2, 16:6, 38:6, 54:1, 55:24 <b>terms</b> [14] - 14:14, 21:18, 27:17, 28:15, 33:11, 33:14, 33:15, 38:9, 38:10, 39:4, 43:7, 47:7, 61:8, 68:3 <b>terribly</b> [2] - 59:17, 60:19 <b>terrific</b> [1] - 68:23 <b>testifies</b> [2] - 69:15, 69:16 <b>testify</b> [11] - 5:23, 6:5, 27:7, 27:8, 27:10, 28:9, 31:14, 32:10, 66:21, 66:24 <b>testifying</b> [4] - 5:21, 5:24, 7:5, 65:1 <b>testimony</b> [8] - 6:4, 6:16, 7:17, 24:18, 28:3, 28:14, 28:20, 72:12 <b>THE</b> [177] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:18, 3:2, 3:11, 3:13, 3:20, 4:5, 4:13, 4:19, 4:21, 5:2, 5:9, 5:12, 6:19, 6:25, 7:18, 7:24, 9:1, 9:3, 10:3, 10:6, 10:16, 10:21, 11:7, 11:10, 11:14, 11:19, 13:3, 13:17, 15:9, 15:17, 15:25, 16:9, 16:13, 16:24, 17:11, 17:23, 18:1, 18:4, 18:10, 18:15, 19:3, 23:23, 24:10, 24:14, 25:13, 25:20, 26:12, 26:15, 28:1, 28:8, 28:21, 29:5, 29:25, 30:19, 31:1, 31:10, 31:12, 32:9, 32:15, 33:20, 34:1, 34:25, 35:5, 35:16, 35:21, 35:23, 36:3, 36:23, 37:10, 38:19, 38:24, 39:8, 39:13, 39:15, 39:22, 40:7, 41:4, 42:2, 43:2, 43:11, 43:21, 44:7, 44:20, 44:24, 45:2, 45:5, 45:9, 45:13, 46:9, 46:20, 47:3, 47:13, 48:12, 48:17, 48:20, 49:2, 49:8, 49:15, 49:18, 50:13, 51:3, 51:8, 51:12,	<b>52:4, 52:9, 52:19, 53:3, 53:6, 53:10, 53:16, 53:19, 54:12, 55:1, 55:5, 55:15, 55:18, 55:20, 56:13, 56:21, 57:2, 57:14, 57:20, 57:23, 58:16, 58:25, 59:6, 59:12, 59:19, 59:23, 60:7, 60:17, 61:11, 61:14, 61:21, 62:22, 62:24, 63:6, 63:9, 63:22, 64:2, 64:4, 64:8, 65:14, 65:17, 65:19, 66:2, 66:17, 66:23, 67:1, 67:12, 67:15, 67:22, 68:2, 68:6, 68:8, 68:17, 69:22, 70:4, 70:9, 70:12, 70:20, 70:24, 71:2, 71:7, 71:21, 72:15, 73:9, 73:11, 75:1, 75:11, 75:18, 76:1, 76:12, 76:23, 76:25     </b>	<b>took</b> [3] - 5:19, 19:15, 38:15 <b>top</b> [1] - 74:2 <b>totally</b> [1] - 38:11 <b>touched</b> [1] - 76:8 <b>towards</b> [2] - 11:24, 54:23 <b>toying</b> [1] - 57:23 <b>trademark</b> [2] - 5:1, 5:5 <b>transaction</b> [2] - 26:2, 53:15 <b>transcript</b> [2] - 75:5, 77:5 <b>transcripts</b> [1] - 72:12 <b>transfer</b> [2] - 24:5, 25:17 <b>transferred</b> [1] - 20:23 <b>transition</b> [1] - 7:16 <b>trial</b> [40] - 8:21, 12:1, 22:10, 22:23, 33:3, 35:12, 36:10, 36:21, 40:8, 43:18, 45:16, 46:2, 46:6, 49:25, 56:4, 56:13, 57:3 <b>trials</b> [1] - 71:15 <b>triangular</b> [1] - 53:7 <b>tried</b> [3] - 18:22, 21:15, 70:18 <b>trouble</b> [1] - 4:23 <b>true</b> [7] - 20:14, 34:16, 36:9, 43:3, 47:12, 54:11, 77:5 <b>truly</b> [1] - 51:4 <b>trust</b> [1] - 23:15 <b>try</b> [5] - 34:13, 41:19, 46:7, 55:24, 62:16 <b>trying</b> [9] - 5:20, 13:13, 60:2, 62:8, 62:10, 63:5, 63:11, 63:18, 69:18 <b>Tuf</b> [1] - 12:17 <b>TUNNELL</b> [1] - 2:10 <b>turn</b> [2] - 7:19, 35:14 <b>turns</b> [1] - 70:15 <b>two</b> [9] - 6:13, 7:8, 7:10, 32:6, 37:11, 37:13, 40:19, 48:7, 75:6 <b>typically</b> [1] - 49:23	<b>U</b> <b>U.K</b> [1] - 1:5 <b>U.S</b> [1] - 77:8 <b>ultimately</b> [1] - 28:18 <b>unchallenged</b> [1] - 40:25 <b>unclean</b> [13] - 16:8, 17:13, 50:15, 54:12, 54:22, 55:6, 55:7, 55:8, 55:17, 55:20, 56:4, 56:13, 57:3 <b>under</b> [33] - 11:25, 12:24, 13:11, 14:2, 15:13, 15:22, 15:23, 16:5, 16:6, 16:21, 18:17, 19:14, 21:8, 21:10, 21:15, 22:3, 22:7, 23:1, 23:21 <b>underlying</b> [1] - 36:6 <b>understandable</b> [1] - 62:9 <b>understood</b> [15] - 4:25, 5:8, 6:24, 10:23, 11:22, 29:5, 43:20, 43:21, 52:8, 57:22, 61:20, 64:7, 67:24, 76:21 <b>undesignate</b> [1] - 72:14 <b>undoubtedly</b> [2] - 35:12, 46:18 <b>undue</b> [1] - 12:24 <b>UNITED</b> [1] - 1:1 <b>United</b> [2] - 1:18, 2:24 <b>universe</b> [2] - 59:9, 60:11 <b>unjust</b> [1] - 49:4 <b>unjustly</b> [1] - 48:23 <b>unless</b> [4] - 26:22, 32:17, 39:25, 56:22 <b>unlicensed</b> [19] - 13:14, 15:21, 16:7, 28:3, 28:6, 28:18, 29:2, 29:19, 29:23, 33:5, 34:9, 34:19, 39:11, 40:4, 41:1, 41:24, 42:12, 42:21, 53:12 <b>unprecedented</b> [1] - 29:18 <b>up</b> [32] - 6:22, 17:16, 26:25, 29:7, 32:5, 32:20, 35:12, 36:7, 37:2, 37:22, 38:17,
<b>T</b> <b>table</b> [2] - 3:15, 68:20 <b>talks</b> [4] - 23:13, 23:17, 23:19, 50:10 <b>TAYLOR</b> [1] - 1:22 <b>technology</b> [25] - 15:3, 15:23, 15:24, 19:11, 20:23, 26:4, 28:4, 28:7, 28:18, 29:2, 29:19, 29:24, 30:9, 33:5, 33:15, 34:9, 34:19, 37:4, 37:5, 39:11, 40:4, 41:23, 42:11, 53:11 <b>ten</b> [2] - 65:3, 65:6 <b>term</b> [1] - 25:2 <b>terminate</b> [2] - 14:7, 55:23	<b>three</b> [8] - 17:23, 17:24, 18:10, 52:20, 57:3, 57:17, 67:19, 75:22 <b>throughout</b> [1] - 14:11 <b>Thursday</b> [1] - 51:16 <b>TLA</b> [17] - 18:18, 18:19, 19:14, 21:5, 21:7, 21:8, 21:10, 21:23, 22:3, 22:13, 22:19, 23:1, 23:3, 23:21 <b>TLAs</b> [3] - 19:5, 20:8, 20:16 <b>today</b> [7] - 3:7, 17:22, 44:2, 46:17, 46:22, 47:6, 65:7	<b>tried</b> [3] - 18:22, 21:15, 70:18 <b>trouble</b> [1] - 4:23 <b>true</b> [7] - 20:14, 34:16, 36:9, 43:3, 47:12, 54:11, 77:5 <b>truly</b> [1] - 51:4 <b>trust</b> [1] - 23:15 <b>try</b> [5] - 34:13, 41:19, 46:7, 55:24, 62:16 <b>trying</b> [9] - 5:20, 13:13, 60:2, 62:8, 62:10, 63:5, 63:11, 63:18, 69:18 <b>Tuf</b> [1] - 12:17 <b>TUNNELL</b> [1] - 2:10 <b>turn</b> [2] - 7:19, 35:14 <b>turns</b> [1] - 70:15 <b>two</b> [9] - 6:13, 7:8, 7:10, 32:6, 37:11, 37:13, 40:19, 48:7, 75:6 <b>typically</b> [1] - 49:23	<b>tried</b> [3] - 18:22, 21:15, 22:3, 22:5, 22:7, 23:1, 23:21, 24:1, 24:23, 41:19, 47:11, 54:5, 55:2, 56:10, 56:17, 56:24, 66:6, 72:7 <b>under</b> [33] - 11:25, 12:24, 13:11, 14:2, 15:13, 15:22, 15:23, 16:5, 16:6, 16:21, 18:17, 19:14, 21:8, 21:10, 21:15, 22:3, 22:5, 22:7, 23:1, 23:21, 24:1, 24:23, 41:19, 47:11, 54:5, 55:2, 56:10, 56:17, 56:24, 66:6, 72:7 <b>underlying</b> [1] - 36:6 <b>understandable</b> [1] - 62:9 <b>understood</b> [15] - 4:25, 5:8, 6:24, 10:23, 11:22, 29:5, 43:20, 43:21, 52:8, 57:22, 61:20, 64:7, 67:24, 76:21 <b>undesignate</b> [1] - 72:14 <b>undoubtedly</b> [2] - 35:12, 46:18 <b>undue</b> [1] - 12:24 <b>UNITED</b> [1] - 1:1 <b>United</b> [2] - 1:18, 2:24 <b>universe</b> [2] - 59:9, 60:11 <b>unjust</b> [1] - 49:4 <b>unjustly</b> [1] - 48:23 <b>unless</b> [4] - 26:22, 32:17, 39:25, 56:22 <b>unlicensed</b> [19] - 13:14, 15:21, 16:7, 28:3, 28:6, 28:18, 29:2, 29:19, 29:23, 33:5, 34:9, 34:19, 39:11, 40:4, 41:1, 41:24, 42:12, 42:21, 53:12 <b>unprecedented</b> [1] - 29:18 <b>up</b> [32] - 6:22, 1	

<p>38:25, 41:8, 42:5, 42:9, 43:16, 44:24, 45:23, 46:1, 46:11, 48:9, 55:24, 62:15, 67:9, 71:15, 72:9, 72:17, 72:25, 73:3, 74:2, 74:18, 75:17 <b>update</b> [1] - 61:9 <b>updated</b> [1] - 76:2 <b>updates</b> [1] - 58:11</p>	<p>67:19, 75:6 <b>weight</b> [1] - 6:17 <b>Weiss</b> [3] - 3:17, 3:18, 73:1 <b>WEISS</b> [1] - 2:13 <b>welcome</b> [1] - 3:20 <b>Welham</b> [2] - 61:16, 74:5 <b>whichever</b> [1] - 16:1 <b>whittle</b> [1] - 61:2 <b>whole</b> [3] - 37:2, 56:4, 61:15 <b>William</b> [1] - 10:1 <b>Williams</b> [11] - 9:6, 9:8, 9:10, 9:11, 9:15, 9:16, 9:22, 9:23, 69:3, 69:15, 69:23 <b>Williamson</b> [2] - 32:22, 44:3 <b>Williamson's</b> [2] - 33:2, 35:15 <b>willing</b> [1] - 33:12 <b>willingness</b> [2] - 33:13, 38:14 <b>Wilmington</b> [1] - 1:15 <b>win</b> [1] - 46:5 <b>wind</b> [1] - 6:22 <b>withdraw</b> [1] - 4:11 <b>withheld</b> [1] - 24:5 <b>withstanding</b> [1] - 46:12 <b>witness</b> [25] - 21:13, 28:14, 33:3, 41:20, 42:5, 61:3, 62:16, 64:8, 64:12, 64:16, 64:24, 64:25, 66:11, 68:5, 68:24, 69:3, 69:19, 69:20, 73:4, 74:6, 74:8, 74:9, 74:16 <b>witnesses</b> [14] - 8:14, 27:13, 40:15, 42:25, 44:4, 44:9, 64:19, 65:4, 65:7, 65:8, 67:20, 69:11, 75:21 <b>words</b> [2] - 8:16, 68:25 <b>works</b> [1] - 5:3 <b>worth</b> [2] - 37:7, 42:7 <b>written</b> [2] - 37:8, 42:8 <b>wrongfully</b> [1] - 24:5</p>	<p>59:24 <b>Ying</b> [3] - 3:17, 7:7, 73:5 <b>YOUNG</b> [1] - 1:22 <b>Young</b> [1] - 3:6</p>
<p><b>V</b></p> <p><b>value</b> [1] - 23:9 <b>various</b> [1] - 57:11 <b>verdict</b> [7] - 14:14, 14:17, 40:23, 49:12, 50:2, 50:11, 54:20 <b>versa</b> [1] - 62:15 <b>version</b> [1] - 58:14 <b>versions</b> [1] - 73:20 <b>versus</b> [1] - 23:3 <b>via</b> [1] - 58:15 <b>vice</b> [3] - 33:3, 62:15, 69:4 <b>vice-president</b> [2] - 33:3, 69:4 <b>video</b> [4] - 70:5, 70:7, 74:23, 76:20 <b>view</b> [6] - 17:18, 29:3, 34:8, 43:8, 53:15, 53:25 <b>violation</b> [1] - 9:20 <b>virtue</b> [2] - 25:25, 67:6 <b>vision</b> [1] - 5:6 <b>voir</b> [4] - 73:14, 75:16, 75:20 <b>voluntary</b> [1] - 4:11 <b>Voss</b> [1] - 66:6 <b>VRANA</b> [1] - 1:23 <b>Vrana</b> [1] - 3:10</p>	<p><b>win</b> [1] - 46:5 <b>wind</b> [1] - 6:22 <b>withdraw</b> [1] - 4:11 <b>withheld</b> [1] - 24:5 <b>withstanding</b> [1] - 46:12 <b>witness</b> [25] - 21:13, 28:14, 33:3, 41:20, 42:5, 61:3, 62:16, 64:8, 64:12, 64:16, 64:24, 64:25, 66:11, 68:5, 68:24, 69:3, 69:19, 69:20, 73:4, 74:6, 74:8, 74:9, 74:16 <b>witnesses</b> [14] - 8:14, 27:13, 40:15, 42:25, 44:4, 44:9, 64:19, 65:4, 65:7, 65:8, 67:20, 69:11, 75:21 <b>words</b> [2] - 8:16, 68:25 <b>works</b> [1] - 5:3 <b>worth</b> [2] - 37:7, 42:7 <b>written</b> [2] - 37:8, 42:8 <b>wrongfully</b> [1] - 24:5</p>	<p><b>Z</b></p> <p><b>zero</b> [2] - 19:23</p>
<p><b>W</b></p> <p><b>wait</b> [4] - 13:17, 42:9, 51:8, 52:22 <b>waited</b> [2] - 55:22, 56:15 <b>waive</b> [1] - 9:25 <b>waived</b> [1] - 46:13 <b>waiver</b> [3] - 56:6, 56:14, 57:4 <b>wants</b> [5] - 18:20, 42:25, 52:13, 69:24 <b>waste</b> [1] - 58:18 <b>ways</b> [1] - 12:25 <b>Wednesday</b> [1] - 1:12 <b>week</b> [3] - 48:8, 52:3, 52:11 <b>weeks</b> [3] - 64:14,</p>	<p><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>year</b> [4] - 55:22, 55:23, 56:11, 56:15 <b>yesterday</b> [1] - 6:10 <b>YING</b> [9] - 2:11, 7:7, 7:19, 9:4, 58:9, 58:22, 59:3, 59:7</p>	